UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. X SPRING, 1958 No. 1

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.
Misgivings on the Ecumenical Movement

AIMÉE BAZY
The Lambeth Conference

J. G. M. WILLEBRANDS
The World Council and the Lordship of Christ

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.
Orthodox Judaism in the United States

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
The Unity Octave Pastoral Letter of His Excellency, Bishop François Charrière — Some Salient Features of the 1958 Octave of Prayer for Christian Unity.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD
BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

UNITAS

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW
ORGAN OF THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

Published by the *Unitas Association* of Rome. Edited by Charles Boyer, S. J., Professor of Patristic Theology, Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome, and Rector of the College of St. Robert Bellarmine.

With Ecclesiastical Approval

Inquiries concerning the work of the *Unitas Association,* and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor:

Rev. Fr. Charles Boyer, S.J.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

Communications and inquiries concerning the English Language Edition should be addressed to the Secretary;

Rev. Fr. Germanus Tomaino, S.A.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscriptions for Italy - 900 Lire (Seminarians 700 Lire)
Subscriptions for the United States and Canada should be addressed to:

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS
Peekskill, New York, U.S.A.

Single Copy — 50 cents . . . Annual Subscriptions $ 2.00
Subscriptions for Great Britain and Ireland should be addressed to:

DUCKETT
The Catholic Book Centre

140, Strand
London. W.C. 2, England

Single Copy — 4 shillings . . . Annual Subscription — 15 shillings

UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. X SPRING, 1958 No. 1

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.
Misgivings on the Ecumenical Movement

AIMÉE BAZY
The Lambeth Conference

J. G. M. WILLEBRANDS
The World Council and the Lordship of Christ

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.
Orthodox Judaism in the United States

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
The Unity Octave Pastoral Letter of His Excellency, Bishop François Charrière — Some Salient Features of the 1958 Octave of Prayer for Christian Unity.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — AROUND THE WORLD
BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

Imprimatur:

† Aloysius Traglia
Archiep. Caesarien. Vicesgerens

Rome, June 7, 1958.

ROME - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

MISGIVINGS ON THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

No one can take it amiss if we of **Unitas** look on ecumenism from a Catholic viewpoint. We rejoice in the least sign of sympathy or good will that comes to us from other confessions. We are especially happy when the Ecumenical Movement inspires meetings between theologians of diverse allegiances, or writings in which the author sets out the positive factors in Protestantism and, after sympathetic and courageous research, makes an effort to understand Catholic doctrine, without fearing to draw closer to it. But we hold fast to our freedom of judgment, and we cannot invariably approve of all that is done.

One of the effects of the Ecumenical Movement has been the formation of the well-known World Council of Churches, an organization made up of nearly all the Protestant denominations, and some of the Orthodox groups. This Council was intended from its beginning to promote Christian unity. It does so when it keeps to its own basic principle, which is faith in the divinity of Christ; it does so through its departments, such as the Commission on *Faith and Order,* which arranges conferences such as that at Lund in 1952, where questions of basic doctrines are seriously studied; it does so again in sponsoring contacts between its own leaders on the one hand and Catholic theologians on the other, who devote themselves to the study of ecumenical questions. But uncertainty is already deepening as to whether it is working effectively towards the true unity in urging various denominations to unite with each other in separate Churches in those cases where the unity is purely exterior and the doctrines of the uniting bodies remain as diverse as they were before the union.

It has come about, however, perhaps from force of circumstance, that the Council, once in existence, has devoted itself to activities other than the quest for unity; it is acting as the representative of its constituent Churches, supporting their interests, protecting their activities, and speaking in their name, while they still preserve their deep diversities. This course inevitably leads it sometimes into acting more or less directly against the Catholic Church, as at last year's conference at New Haven, Connecticut,

where a motion was passed that was hostile to the Catholic Church; and at other times into taking decisions opposed to Catholic interests.

I know that the World Council is free to act as it sees fit, and that its position, to use existentialist terminology, sometimes (and often enough) naturally favours a tendency which is hardly pleasing to us. But my only concern here is to give expression to the uneasiness which certain of its steps is generating. This uneasiness is perhaps felt by all Catholics, but it affects particularly those of us who are collaborating in ecumenical work, in the attempt, that is, to realise the true unity of faith among Christians. It is an ecumenical uneasiness.

At the beginning of last August the Central Committee of the Council met at the Divinity School of Yale, at New Haven. One of the most important subjects dealt with at this meeting, if not the most important, was the integration, that is, the unification of the World Council of Churches and of the International Missionary Council. No decision could be taken in this matter, although the question has been studied ever since 1956, because it is the responsibility of the future General Assembly, the third, which is to take place in 1960 or 1961. But the Central Commitee's report which presented the question to the member-Churches strongly supported the possibility of such an integration, and strove to overcome the objections which had been raised against it (1). The General Secretary, Mr. Visser't Hooft, had also put forward this integration as something essential to the Ecumenical Movement. « It has been asked », he had said, « whence has the pressure arisen for the integration of these two world organizations. The main answer should be, from the heart of the Ecumenical Movement itself. » (2) The Assembly of the International Missionary Council on its side, meeting at Achimota in Ghana, approved the integration by fifty votes to seven. The President of the Central Committee of the World Council, Dr. Fry, intervened to stress the urgency of the matter. (3) One may therefore regard the fusion of these two bodies as a foregone conclusion.

Now one can easily see what this means from the Catholic point of view. From now on the promoter and supporter of non-Catholic missions (which means practically all the Protestant missions) will be the World Council of Churches. Already the Catholic

---

(1) Cfr. *World Council of Churches. Minutes and Reports of the Tenth Meeting of the Central Committee*, pp. 56-59.

(2) *ibid., P.* 84.

(3) EPS, 1958, n. 1.

missionaries have been seeing their activities in all missionary countries hampered by those of the Protestants. By the integration of the Missionary Council with the World Council, with its organization and resources, Protestant missions will be reinforced and multiplied where they already exist, and will start up where they do not. And as certain Protestant denominations take upon themselves the duty of « evangelizing » Catholics, their activities will be aided and protected by the same Council. But cannot one say that, after all, the Council has already been doing this for some time? Perhaps, but at least it has done so more discreetly and indirectly, and less obviously. But in the future it will do so as a direct duty and as an essential task. How can the Catholic not feel uneasy in the face of such an ecumenism?

The Ecumenical Movement which he has hailed with enthusiasm, and to whose progress he is ready to devote time and trouble has but one *raison* d'être: to bring Christian disunity to an end, and to bring Christians together into the unity of one faith. The task is noble enough and arduous enough to form a splendid crusade. Doubtless the Christian has other tasks: to propagate the faith, to relieve misery, to strive for peace, to struggle against injustice, to enlighten ignorance. But organizations already exist, or can exist, for all these purposes. If the Ecumenical Movement becomes side-tracked in these directions it will lose its singleness of purpose; it will dissipate itself; it will immerse itself in particular issues, encouraging the one and impairing the other. It will no longer be a promoter of Christian unity but merely a relief agency for a certain number of Christian denominations which it will continue to maintain in their disunity.

And as the various non-Catholic missionary societies in pagan countries are opposed to the labours of the Catholic Church, the World Council will also appear as the adversary of that Church. Will the movement, then, be able to call itself ecumenical any longer?

Some have found it difficult to understand why the Catholic Church has refused membership in the World Council of Churches. Leaving aside for the moment other reasons, how can it belong to an organization which works against its own missions and which supports preachers whose teaching it declares to be heretical? Fr. Florovsky, a theologian of the Russian Orthodox Church which is a member of the Council, fully realises the difficulty for a Church which calls itself Orthodox to be linked up with a Council which is responsible for Protestant missions; and he has protested against this integration from the beginning.

And here is another instance which shows how well-founded

are the misgivings we have expressed. In a recent number of the official publication of the World Council, the *Ecumenical Review,* there appeared an article signed by Benjamin Moraes, with the title « The Tremendous Importance of Ecumenism in Latin America » (4). This points out that Latin America must be evangelised, that it would be deplorable if this were to be done either by the sects or by the intolerant and persecuting Catholics: therefore it is an urgent task for the Genevan Council to undertake. Here is a quotation from this article: — « For it is only through the inspiration of a good ecumenical spirit that the new Latin American generation will spread a sound influence throughout the world, taking everywhere the spirit of service, and never the despotical ideas of the Roman Latin Church or of Communism. » (p. 86). There can be no doubt that for Mr. Benjamin Moraes, ecumenism is to be identified with liberal evangelical Protestantism.

I could have read these sadly lucid pages without much surprise had they appeared in some Lutheran or Calvinist magazine. But I admit I was overwhelmed to find them in the *Ecumenical Review,* and I found myself thinking that ecumenism, if it was indeed what I believed it to be, was still a distant ideal. It is painful to envision the transplanting of our European divisions to these Latin American countries where Christianity was brought by the Catholic missionaries of Spain and Portugal, where there is a natural tendency towards Catholic unity, and to entrust this very task to the Council set up to promote unity!

I am aware that the objection could be raised that the Catholic Church has advanced itself by the selfsame methods. She also has her missions; she also branches out into Protestant countries; she is active and advancing in England, America, and Scandinavia. This is true, but she does not pretend to invoke any idea of equality. The Catholic Church is not a World Council. Everyone knows that she strives to advance and conforms to her own principles. She seeks to gather all men together under her wing in order to bring salvation to all, for she is the ark of salvation. She is ecumenical, or universal, but she is also well aware that the other confessions will not find elsewhere the unity which belongs to her. Her own expansion is the expansion of the true unity. The World Council is an organ of multiplicity; if it acts in the name of its diversity it can only propagate divisions.

And here in particular we arrive at the crucial point. The difficulties which we have pointed out here can scarcely be avoided as long as the profound disunity of doctrine continues to persist.

---

(4) *The Ecumenical Review,* vol. X, n. 2, January 1958, pp. 182-186.

Doubtless the Council could hold itself aloof from particular doctrines, more than it has up until now, in order to maintain its position as far as possible as an upholder of unity. But whatever it does, it will always find itself on the inside of some doctrine. It will find itself even more in this position if it takes up the special interests of its member-Churches, if it speaks in their name, if it urges them on to corporate activities, and if it maintains and supports their missions. I do not know whether it will be able to keep them all content for long. But in any case, it will find itself often opposed, like its member-Churches, to the Roman Catholic Church. Now, if one thing is certain, and even admitted by many ecumenists, it is that there can be no Christian unity without that Church.

It is the one Church that is inseparable from its doctrine, regulates its activities in accordance with it, and zealously strives to spread it. For that reason it must be in opposition to any Church of different doctrine, and sometimes she combats it. Between these two Churches there may be certain understandings and reciprocal help, the witness of a certain fraternity, but the division remains deep and capable at the slightest incident of awakening hostility.

Even more recently, Pastor Albert Finet, director of the Protestant weekly review *Réforme,* received some rather sharp complaints from certain Catholic friends over an inquiry which he had published on Lourdes, which (unlike a similar article in the Anglican *Church Times*) was not very sympathetic. He replied very courteously, yet there is a passage in his reply which I think is especially significant: « For a Protestant like myself, when I consider that the glory of God, the Dominion of Jesus Christ which I have received in the way that St. Paul understood it, are at stake, it is in all charity impossible for me to be silent; on the contrary, it is the love which I bear for the faith in my Lord and for my fellowmen which compels me to speak. That is exactly what happened when I asked my collaborators to undertake that inquiry into Lourdes. » (5)

In January we had witnessed another extensive observation of the Unity Octave. Everything tended towards understanding and the sincerest Christian charity. But the centenary of Lourdes was at hand, something which everyone was talking about, and which glorifies the Blessed Virgin Mary and her cultus. Protestant doctrine rejects this cultus as an offence to the supreme Dominion of Christ, and so also does Pastor Finet. Accordingly, he makes it his duty in conscience to undertake an inquiry into Lourdes; and

---

(5) *Reforme,* March 1, 1958, p. 3.

his inquiry, conducted by Protestants like himself, cannot help but offend Catholics. Unfortunately, there was nothing in all of this to advance genuine Christian unity. What we must do instead is to get to the root of our divisions, which is doctrine.

Is the cultus of the Mother of God really against the rights of Christ? Not a few Protestants have come to understand that it is nothing of the kind. If Pastor Finet had been among them, *Réforme* would doubtless have reported on Lourdes in a different light.

Christian unity is a blessing so great that everything which can be done to promote it should be encouraged. More fervent prayer, the increase of mutual contacts and co-operation, the promotion of reciprocal edification — all that is excellent. But one must get down to doctrines, to the fundamental dogmas. We know, for example, that it is the will of Christ for His Church to expand. Was it then, to be left without authority and without priesthood, or on the other hand, was it organised with a suitable hierarchy and appropriate sacraments? Can doctrine have an historical development and yet remain the same in substance? Were the reasons which led to divisions valid, and are they still so today? These are the questions — and there are others — which workers for unity should constantly ask and study. If there is no more endeavour to reach understanding on these points, disquiet will multiply. Holy Scripture does not separate charity from truth, but it asks us to live « speaking the truth in love ». (Ephes. iv, 15).

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

If the Anglican *Church* is distinctively English, the Anglican *Communion* includes all those Churches which have evolved from the Mother-Church of Canterbury and which follow their own paths throughout the whole world. These Churches have for the most part been established by English missionaries, but although they are to be found in Far Eastern countries such as China and Japan, they are more fully developed in the British Dominions and Colonies; thus for longer os shorter periods the countries of the New-World were subject to English influences. These Churches often bear the title of Episcopalian Churches, which clearly distinguishes them from other Protestant denominations. The Episcopal Church of the United States has a special importance, and so has the Anglican Church in Canada which is strongly established in the English-speaking provinces. Australia, New Zealand, the Carribean, South Africa, British East Africa, India, and so on, have their Anglican dioceses.

It is most important to realise that these Churches are completely independent of the Primatial See of Canterbury. The Primate of England has no powers of jurisdiction over them; they are bound to the Church of England only by ties of friendship, respect, and common traditions. They believe that the Prayer-Book contains the principles of Anglican doctrine and practice, but in most cases they claim the right to revise and modify its contents to suit their own special conditions. The Churches of Canada, the United States, and South Africa as well as the Anglican Churches of Scotland and Ireland have already done this. They have their own Provincial and General Synods, and their own Primates and Metropolitan Bishops.

These Churches, also known as Provinces, independent of each other, have felt the need of coming together from time to time to exchange points of view and to pool their experiences. Thus the assembly of Anglican Bishops from all over the world known as the Lambeth Conference came into being. The initiative for the first of these Conferences came from the Church of Canada. The Lambeth Conference meets every ten years, but this interval has been somewhat disrupted by two world wars.

The first assembly took place in 1867, and the ninth will be held in a few months, in July 1958. The numbers of those participating has steadily increased. At the first Conference seventy-six prelates were present out of the hundred and forty-four who were invited. In 1948 there were three hundred and twenty-nine « Archbishops and Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church » (in the Anglican sense of the word). Because of this great increase it has been decided that Suffragan and Assistant Bishops (1) should not be invited to the next Conference.

It must be understood that the Lambeth Conference is not in any sense a General Synod of the Anglican Churches, for it has no powers of legislation. It makes recommendations which the various Provinces are free to accept or reject as they will in their own legislative assemblies.

In the letter of invitation sent out for the first Lambeth Conference in 1867 by Dr. Longley, Archbishop of Canterbury, it was made clear that « this Conference will not be competent to make declarations or publish definitions in matters of doctrine. » This precaution was taken because of the anxiety which had been aroused among the Anglican episcopate when the Conference was first announced. The Bishops feared that problems relating to certain contemporary events would be raised which might question the constitution and government of the Church. The Anglican world was profoundly shaken at this time by the affair of Bishop Colenso of Natal in South Africa, which it should be remembered, has still its repercussions in the Anglican Church a century later. Although the Archbishop of Canterbury had given his personal assurance that this matter would not be debated at Lambeth, it became clear from the very first session that the issue could not altogether be avoided. The facts are these: In 1847 Archbishop Gray was nominated to the See of Cape Town by letters-patent from the Crown. Because of the growing importance of this territory it was decided that a new Diocese should be set up in Natal, which was to be detached from the Diocese of Archbishop Gray. In response to this situation Dr. Gray tendered his resignation, and was immediat-

---

(1) Anglican Suffragan Bishops are not comparable to those of the Catholic Church who rule over their own dioceses. They are rather delegated by the Diocesan to assist him in the general work of the Diocese, and they take their titles from some town in the Diocese. They are dependent on the Diocesan Bishop and their appointment must be renewed at each change of Bishop. Assistant Bishops have less authority than Suffragans.

(*Translator's note*: — Assistant Bishops in England are usually retired missionary, colonial, or Suffragan Bishops who when they reside in a Diocese, are usually given this title. No one is actually consecrated to it.)

ely re-appointed by new letters-patent to the re-adjusted Diocese. Bishop Colenso also received letters-patent which declared him subject and subordinate to the Archbishop of Cape Town, to whom he had to swear an oath of obedience. The extremely temerarious theological opinions of Dr. Colenso soon disturbed the Anglican authorities. A *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* appeared in 1861, followed by the publication of two volumes on the Pentateuch, gave further cause for anxiety. The matter was discussed by the Convocation of Canterbury. Dr. Tait, Bishop of London, raised the question of inhibiting Dr. Colenso from officiating in any Anglican Diocese, but forty-one English Bishops wrote to the Bishop of Natal to ask him if he could save situation without injury to his conscience. Dr. Colenso replied that to resign would put him in the wrong; he refused to give up his see or to retract anything of his doctrine.

While this matter was being debated in London, inside and outside Convocation, Archbishop Gray ordered the Bishop of Natal to appear for judgment at Cape Town in November 1863. Dr. Colenso, then in England, ignored the summons. It was then discovered that the letters-patent issued to Dr. Gray when his Diocese was re-adjusted had no juridical authority. For an independent constitutional government had been established at the Cape in 1850, and since that time the British Crown had relinquished its rights to confer coercive jurisdiction by letters-patent. In spite of this discovery Dr. Gray began the trial. Dr. Colenso refused to appear, and denied that the Archbishop of Cape Town had any jurisdiction over him. Gray deposed Colenso, who appealed to the Privy Council. On March 20, 1865, the Lord Chancellor gave judgment in his favour. Dr. Colenso returned to his diocese in spite of the fact that Dr. Gray had excommunicated him.

Dr. Gray wanted the approval and support of the English Bishops, and gave notice to Convocation that he would ask whether they were in communion with him or with Dr. Colenso. The members of Convocation replied with one of those extremely nebulous statements in which the English temperament peculiarly excels. They stated that they were in communion with Dr. Gray, but refused to say whether they were or were not in communion with Dr. Colenso. They even voted a resolution by means of which, by neither electing nor refusing to elect a new Bishop of Natal, Dr. Colenso was able to remain in communion with the Church of England.

The result of this seven-year controversy was the emergence of two Anglican bodies in South Africa, the Church of England in South Africa, and the Church of the Province of South Africa.

Even a century later the dilemma has not altogether been resolved; in 1955 the present Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Fisher, stated that Bishop Morris (who had been elected by the Colenso faction) was to be considered as having placed himself outside communion with the See of Canterbury, and outside the community or the Anglican Communion. Bishop Morris's supporters replied that the Church of the Province was schismatic, and that in pretending to excommunicate Bishop Morris the Archbishop of Canterbury was audaciously and unconstitutionally intervening in the affairs of a sovereign State. (2).

This was the atmosphere in which the first Lambeth Conference was held. In spite of the assurances given by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Colenso affair was widely discussed in the course of its stormy sessions, and gave rise to a great many disputes and lobby intrigues outside the official sessions.

It is not without interest to note that this first Lambeth Conference might very well have been the last. The Bishops retained bitter memories of it, and doubted whether it would be wise to summon a second, but the persistence of the Bishops of Lichfield in England and of Pittsburgh in America, supported to a great extent by the Canadian Bishops, wore down the misgivings of Dr. Tait, who had succeeded Dr. Longley as Archbishop of Canterbury. He called the second Conference for 1878, and made it quite clear in his letter that as regards doctrinal matters no change could be proposed or debated, and no definition of doctrine would be discussed. As regards discipline, each Church had its own tribunals for the administration of its ecclesiastical law over which the Conference claimed no right of intervention. The questions to be dealt with in this session were mainly of a domestic nature. It was not until the third Conference in 1888 that the ecumenical possibilities of such gatherings were clearly realised. This was presided over by Dr. Benson as Archbishop of Canterbury, and adopted resolutions rejoicing in the amicable relations which had been established between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Patriarch of Constantinople and the other Patriarchs and Bishops of the Orthodox East, and expressed the wish that the barriers in the way of fuller intercommunion might be lowered in the course of time. « But their use of icons, the invocation of the Saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary made closer relations difficult. »

---

(2) [Translator's note: The « Church of England in South Africa » is incomparably the smaller of the two bodies, amounting to little more than a splinter-group today. It is modernist and Protestant, the protest being largely against the High Church tendencies of the Church of the Province.]

The main result of this third Conference was the adoption of what is known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral, the substance of which is the unalterable minimum required as a possible basis of union, whether with episcopal or non-episcopal bodies. In its original form the Quadrilateral was the work of the Episcopal Church of America at a Chicago conference in 1886.

The members of the Conference adopted the four following points as forming an inherent part of the sacred deposit bequeathed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church: — (1) the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed word of God; (2) the Nicene Creed as an adequate exposition of the Christian faith; (3) the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, instituted by Christ; (4) the historic Episcopate, locally adapted as to its methods functioning among the various nations of the world and the peoples called by God into the unity of His Church.

Dr. Benson decided that the fourth Conference should be held, not in 1898 but in 1897. The reason for this change was twofold. The Primate wanted it to co-incide with the important meetings of the Anglican Episcopate which were to celebrate the 13th centenary of the coming of St. Augustine to England, for by an extraordinary paradox the Anglicans regard this Papal envoy as the founder of their Church. Again, the Bull of Leo XIII on the validity of Anglican ordinations had recently been published.

Dr. Benson died suddenly while on a visit to Gladstone at Hawarden, and the Conference which he had called was presided over by his successor Dr. Temple. It was concerned mainly with such questions as temperance, and the purity and sanctity of marriage.

The Fifth and Sixth Conferences were presided over by Dr. Randall Davidson, who has been considered the ablest Primate of the century. The Fifth Conference was attended by 242 Bishops, and of the eleven Reports which were heard, the first (*Faith and Modern Thought*), the eighth (*Problems of Marriage*), and the last (*Reunion and Intercommunion*) touched on problems which seemed fated to confront each succeeding Lambeth Conference without finding a solution.

The Sixth Conference was held in 1920, after the upheaval of the Great War. Bishop Gore had not concealed from Dr. Davidson the fact that he dreaded it. He feared that the Conference would become the closed preserve of modernists and reunionists. And for the first time the Bishops seemed to realise that modernism had become a question of urgent importance. The wisdom and authority of Archbishop Davidson, however, kept the peace

between the extremists of both parties. The climax of this Sixth Conference was an appeal for unity in the form of the *Letter to All Christian Peoples*. This declaration gave a fresh impetus to the reunion movement, and may be considered as one of the most important events which preceeded the formation of the World Council of Churches. It also formed the occasion for the Malines Conversations.

The years which followed this Conference saw the development of numerous assemblies which investigated possibilities of intercommunion with episcopalian and non-episcopalian bodies. Those were also the years of the Malines Conversations, whose negative results were not unforeseeable as a foregone conclusion arising from the extreme diversity of beliefs among Anglicans. At this time, too, the mutual recognition of orders took place between the Church of England and certain Continental denominations. In 1925 the Old Catholics of Holland, followed by their co-religionists of Switzerland and Germany, recognised without reservation that the Apostolic Succession had not been broken in England. There were also co-consecrations with the Scandinavian Churches, and a recognition by the exercise of « economy » of Anglican orders by the Ecumenical Patriarch, a decision which was not binding, however, on the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches.

Archbishop Davidson resigned his Archbishopric on his golden wedding day, November 12, 1928. He was eighty years old in the preceeding April, and realising that he would be too old to preside effectively over the 1930 Conference, he wished to give his successor time to prepare for it.

As was foreseen, Prime Minister Baldwin proposed Dr. Lang, Archbishop of York, for Royal approval as Primate. He was enthroned in December 1929.

The 1930 Conference was noted for its adoption of a resolution on marriage and sex, of which a paragraph on birth-control raised widespread indignation and much spilling of ink unusual in Great Britain. The Bishops in effect accepted the fact that moral situations could arise in which family limitation necessitating the use of other methods than abstinence was permissible. They added that they could not absolutely condemn the use of prudent scientific methods adopted in good conscience for the prevention of conception. The whole resolution was passed by 193 votes to 67. One solitary prelate, Dr. Carey of Bloemfontein, retired from the Conference as an act of protest, and took the initiative in petitioning the King.

We may remember that shortly afterwards on December 31, 1930, His Holiness Pope XI gave the true judgment of the Church on this question in his Encyclical *Casti Connubii*: —

> « Wherefore, since there are some who, openly departing from the Christian teaching which has been handed down uninterruptedly from the beginning , have in recent times thought fit solemnly to preach another doctrine concerning this practice, the Catholic Church, to whom God has committed the task of teaching and preserving morals and right conduct in their integrity, standing erect amidst this moral devastation, raises her voice ... through Our mouth ... ».

Dr. Lang had expressed his intention of retiring at the age of 75, but the war postponed this decision which was not realised until March 1942. His successor, the second Dr. Temple, died suddenly in 1944, and was succeeded by Dr. Fisher, the present Primate. He it is who presided at the last Lambeth Conference in 1948. It was dominated by two problems, marriage discipline and Christian unity. The Bishops, disturbed by the number of homes broken up by divorce, re-stated that marriage was a life-long union, and that re-marriage in Church should be refused to those who had a former partner still living. But the admission of the re-married « innocent party » to Holy Communion was left to the discretion of the Diocesan Bishops.

A great part of this Conference was taken up with the discussion of the Church of South India, which has been the subject of various articles in *Unitas*. In the face of opposition from certain overseas Bishops, mainly those of the United States, it was decided that the Conference should accept that experimental reunion between Anglicans and Protestant groups, limited to the Indian territories involved, for a trial period of thirty years, after which the Conference should decide whether or not this intercommunion with non-Episcopal Churches should be extended to the entire Anglican Communion. It is well known that the Convocations of Canterbury and York anticipated this by officially recognising the validity of the Church of South India's orders in 1955, and opened the Churches of England to the ministrations and offices of the new Church. This question will be raised again in the course of the 1958 sessions, (3) and at the same time certain

(3) [Translator's note: In January of this year the Synod of the Church of South India approved the draft of certain drastic revisions of their Ordinal in a Protestant direction, in which the actual form of conferring orders has been profoundly modified. Their action in doing so *after* their orders

further reunion projects between the Methodists and Presbyterians on the one hand and the Church of England on the other. The meetings will certainly be lively and possibly acrimonious. One must expect opposition from certain Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

It behoves the Catholic to pray for this coming Conference, asking the Holy Spirit to illumine those who take part in it, that rising above their internal differemces they may find the path which leads to that unity in the faith that is the will of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

AIMÉE BAZY

---

had been recognised in England is sure to be severely criticised, and in view of the fresh form there are sure to be some who will press for a fresh inquiry into their orders.]

THE WORLD COUNCIL AND THE LORDSHIP OF CHRIST *

In 1947 Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft delivered the Stone Lectures at the Princeton Theological Seminary, taking as this theme, « The Kingship of Christ » (later published in English and Dutch).

The intention of the Secretary of the World Council of Churches was to make Americans understand the theological principles and the spiritual content of the struggles waged by the Protestant Churches during the war. He brought out in particular how the European churches — which were always opposed to American activism and to the theory of the « Social Gospel » — had been able to speak in a forceful and prophetic language to authorities and to nations. A new dialogue had thus been opened between the churches and the world. Its foundation was theological and had nothing to do with opinions regarding the « Social Gospel ».

Since Dr. Visser 't Hooft, by his strong personality and comprehensive ability, has spearheaded discussion within the World Council of Churches, I believe it would be important for the topic under consideration to give an exposition of his thought with reference to the Lordship of Christ.

His point of departure is the theology which occupies the central position in the system of Calvin, more particularly that of the three functions of Christ. If one were to place this theology in the center of Christology and accentuate one of the three functions at the expense of the others, it would constitute a deviation from Christology itself. Hence, Dr. Visser 't Hooft declares: « «Protestantism has followed a theological tradition in which the priestly and prophetic functions of Christ have been studied with great care, but in which the kingly function has remained in obscurity. Here we are dealing with the cosmic Christ, with Him who is not only Lord of the Church, but forthwith, though invisibly, the Sovereign of the Universe, to whom has been given all power in Heaven and on earth. (*Het Koningschap van Christus*, 1947, p. 12).

---

* The abridgement of a conference by J. G. M. Willebrands of Warmond, Holland.

« And this is why an appeal has been made to us to render witness in a particular manner to Christ as King and to give expression to the fully cosmic sense of the story of salvation. »

This is perhaps the first delineation undertaken within the World Council of Churches of the theme of the « Lordship of Christ in the Church and in the World. »

It must be noted that there is an essential difference between the theology of Luther and Calvin on the one hand, and Catholic teaching on the other, concerning the manner in which the threefold function of Christ is present in the Church. In consequence, an essential difference of opinion likewise arises regarding the manner in which the Church is a medium for establishing the Lordship of Christ in the world.

Luther and Calvin are both hesitant when confronted with the cosmic aspects of biblical eschatology. Luther fears a confusion between the Kingdom of Christ and the Kingdom of the World. He gives an autonomous significance to the order of creation. Thus, he abstracts the Kingdom of the World from the Lordship of Christ, and the two kingdoms exist separately side by side. Calvin, in his turn, pursues two concepts: according to the first he views the world as departing from general grace and from the law of nature (namely, the order of creation); according to the second, his point of departure is the universal Sovereignty of Christ. For Dr. Visser 't Hooft, this last concept constitutes the proper vision of Calvinism.

In the theology of the two Reformers, the doctrine of the Royalty of Christ remains in the background or else restricts itself to a Royalty within the Church. This is why Protestantism tends not only to see the Kingdom of Christ as an invisible one, but even more to limit it solely to the human soul. (op. cit., p. 18).

In the nineteenth century, the principal schools of Protestant theology no longer saw in Jesus Christ the priest and the king, but only the prophet. This prophet proclaims a timeless truth and principles which human thought subsequently elaborates for the elevation of man. For Renan and Harnack, Christ is the prophet of the perfect idealism. His eschatological expectation is an illusion. But yet from the moment Christ is no longer acknowledged as a priest and king, He remains little more than a preacher of religious ideas.

Confronted with this immanentist concept, Jean Weiss and Albert Schweitzer saw in the proclamation of the future divine Kingdom the very heart of Christian preaching. They rejected rationalist theology, but in their era they were unsuccessful in

pointing out the way to a new theology. This, however, has been done by Bultmann and by Barth.

Bultmann, for instance, has introduced a new eschatological concept. This is no longer an *engeschichtliche Eschatologie* but an *übergeschichtliche Eschatologie*: the Kingdom is not realized in time; it is above time — each epoch constitutes the last times. The essence of the Kingdom is the *Wunderbare*, its marvelousness, the *Ganz-Andere*, its completely different character. Royalty is not a condition of this world. For man, the Kingdom means that he is to decide at all times against the world. This is what makes up the great *Entweder-Oder*, ' either ... or '.

During the period between the two world wars, great efforts were expended to arrive at a new theology, and through it to define the relation of the churches to the world. At the time of the Stockholm Conference in 1925 it was quite evident how little was known of the doctrine of Sacred Scripture and of theology relative to the meaning which the Kingdom of God has for this world, and concerning the place of the Church in the Kingdom of God. European theologians had little to say in a positive sense in the face of American positivism and the « Social Gospel ».

At a time when the world seemed to be freed from demoniacal and destructive powers, the churches became aware of their prophetic task, namely, the duty of announcing the victory of Christ over those powers and of His Sovereignty over the world. In this the churches went beyond both Calvin and Luther.

In what degree have the great historical events and the confrontation of the churches with history aided theological reflection in rediscovering that salvation itself is something historical? Oscar Cullmann has had the merit of demonstrating that the history of salvation is at the very heart of evangelical preaching. (1) He opposes the « linear » notion of time in Sacred Scripture to the Greek notion which is cyclic in character. Thus, in contrast with the opinion of existential eschatology, history recovers its value, in the same way as does the realist and cosmic view of the Kingdom.

Cullmann appeals to the most ancient Christian confession of *Christos Kurios*: Christ is Lord. The significance of this is that, as King, Christ reigns not only over men, but also over all the powers in Heaven, on earth, and under the earth. This title has been given to Jesus Christ who now sits at the right hand of the Father.

---

(1) *Königsherrschaft Christi und Kirche in Neuen Testament*, 1941; *Christus und die Zeit*, 1946.

Christ is the Mediator of Creation (Col., I, 16; John, I, 3; Hebrews, I, 2), and also the Mediator of the new creation (I Thess. IV, 16). Christ is Sovereign, and yet at the same time, His Kingdom will not be fully established until the end of time.

The question arises as to the manner in which He exercises His power at present, and in what way it is related to His future Kingdom. Another question that differs, but which is directly connected with it, is that concerning the place of the Church in the Kingdom of Christ. The whole question of the latter, according to Cullmann, revolves about the relation between Creation and the Redemption; it is a particular application of it. What affects man affects also the entire universe because of man. Man is above all creatures by reason of his likeness to God. In the wake of his sin, the whole earth has been cursed with him. When man is saved by Christ, the whole of creation participates likewise in his redemption (Col. I, 20).

The Protestant theology of our day has witnessed an unheard of development. Fifty years ago the problem of the Sovereignty of Christ over the Church and the world would not have been seriously brought forward. It could not have been properly dealt with for various reasons. But today Christ is willingly and openly confessed as the *Kurios*, and there has been a marked tendency towards the eschatological fulfillment: *Maranatha* — the Lord cometh. It is only in the light of this evolution that we can understand how this theme has come to the fore.

The General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, in the course of his Stone Lectures, has already revealed the ecumenical importance of this subject. A Church, he declared, which takes the Kingship of Christ seriously is a Church which is striving to re-establish the unity of the Church of Christ. If there is but one King, if the redemption signifies being part of the one Body, then no Church can resign itself before the fact that the people of God is dispersed and the Body is bruised. It is not in view of a greater efficacy of their practical task, nor in view of a common front against their mutual enemies, but it is in order to affirm their fidelity to the King — whose Kingdom cannot be divided against itself — that the churches must undertake the difficult pilgrimage of arriving at a visible and tangible unity. (*Het Koningschap van Christus*, p. 105).

There is a close relation between the theme « The Lordship of Christ over the Church and the World » and the main theme of the Evanston Assembly: « Christ, the Hope of the World ». The truth is that Christian hope is founded upon the crucified and risen Saviour. We are not living by a nostalgia for an

earthly paradise, but in expectation of the Kingdom of God. Henceforth, the forces of that Kingdom are at work in the Church to which Christ gave His Spirit. It is only by the presence of that power that we are able to base our hope on the futureKingdom. The World Council has thrown into relief that the Church is the « pilgrim people of God », but also that the faithful, like the Church, are contaminated by sin. Simul justa et peccatrix.

The World Council, in particular, designates the division of Christians as being the consequence of sin which has affected the Church to such an extent that it cannot attain to visibility and unity in this world.

The Orthodox protested at Evanston — but for other motives than certain American sectors — against the unilateral accentuation of the eschatological character of the Kingdom. Among other things, they said: « We strongly believe that it is necessary to place adequate emphasis on the actual presence of the Kingdom of God in the Church ... » « It is misleading to describe the Church simply as ' the pilgrim people of God ' and to forget that the Church Triumphant and the Church Militant are but one Body ».

Concerning the report of the section on Faith and Order, the Orthodox delegates declared: « The unity of the Church should not be interpreted in a purely eschatological manner, but as a present reality, called to receive its consummation on the last day ». (*Istina,* 1954, p. 362).

The delegates from the Orthodox Churches were equally opposed to the idea that the Church should be contaminated by sin, and they declared: « The reality of the New Life is never compromised or annulled by our failures. Thus, the Church of Christ, as the realized Kingdom of God, lies beyond Judgment, whereas her members being liable to sin and error are subject to Judgment ». (*Ecumenical Review,* Oct. 1954, p. 67).

In 1955 the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches commissioned the Division of Studies to undertake a biblical study on the « Lordship of Christ over the World and over the Church ». From July 5 to 8, 1956, a consultative conference was held at Arnoldshain for the purpose of assembling biblical and theological texts referring to that subject. Following the conference, a document was published which served as the principal work guide for the first year of study.

It becomes immediately evident that an effort has been made to pursue and to explore theologically many of those questions which were presupposed at Evanston and which were not resolved.

The theme of the Lordship of Christ over the world and over the Church is not the result of an exclusively biblical and theo-

logical inquiry; for the World Council is concerned not with a problem which is uniquely theological, but with Christian existence itself; just as the World Council itself is the fruit, not of theological speculation, but of the well understood necessity that all Christians be united in one sole Church, in order that there be, in the words of St. Paul, « One Lord, one faith, one baptism ». Theological research is therefore at the service of a very concrete task. The message of the Evanston Assembly conveys its solicitude quite aptly when it declares: « To stay together is not enough. We must go forward ».

J. G. M. Willebrands

ORTHODOX JUDAISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Orthodoxy, strangely enough, although present on the American scene many years before Reform or Conservative Judaism, has been the last of the three American Jewish religious movements to organize itself. The name itself, Greek in derivation and Western in application, came into vogue especially as indicating reaction against what were considered divergent modes of Judaism. This quasi-negative side of the movement is highly indicative of its nature, and characteristic of much of its history on American soil. Finally awakened and organized, however, Orthodoxy is now trying to present a more positive picture in its belief and practice, although it still has many and difficult problems to resolve.

The features just mentioned are significant elements of Orthodoxy in America and deserve further attention. We shall therefore divide our study into first, a brief history of Orthodoxy in the United States, secondly, a survey of Orthodox practice, and thirdly, problems and prospects of Orthodoxy.

A Brief History

The five million Jews currently in the United States, as well as the vast majority of the rest of the population, have their background and roots in Europe. They or their forefathers before them were immigrants. Especially is this true, of course, of the earliest settlers. The first Jews came to America from Spain or Portugal in 1654. Because the Hebrew name for the Spanish peninsula is *Sepharad,* these immigrants into Colonial America were known as « Sephardim ». The name differentiated them from their fellow Jews in Central and Eastern Europe who are called « Ashkenazim » from the Hebrew word, *Ashkenaz,* for Germany.

The religion of the first Jews in America — Sephardim and Ashkenazim alike — was the traditional Orthodoxy they brought with them from their homeland. They believed and lived the teachings of the *Torah,* the Written Law contained in the Old Testament and the Oral Law handed down from Moses. Since

Jewish law or tradition develops by the application of precedent to new situations, the first American Jews also accepted the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds, early records of the tradition, as well as the various codes based on the Talmuds, particularly that called the *shulhan Aruch* of Joseph Caro, and the answers of leading rabbis, adapting the immutable principles of Judaism to changing conditions.

Conditions in America, however, were unlike anything the Jews had ever encountered before. In Europe for centuries the Jews had led almost a sheltered existence. For the most part they lived in closed groups, apart and separated from non-Jews; in their settlements they were able to carry on the traditional practices of Jewry with comparative peace and uniformity. As a group they had their troubles, but within their ranks in most cases Orthodoxy and tradition held complete sway.

When the Jews came to the United States, on the other hand, they entered what has been called a « permissive », « open », and secularistic society. There they were able to achieve rights of equal citizenship, abundant opportunities for material and social advancement, and a free access to the adoption of a new civilization. When their system of culture, Eastern in its thought, traditional in its practice, and static in its mode of religious expression met the Western world with its independence, its dynamism, its wide-open opportunities for change, there was bound to be a crisis in the life of the immigrant Jews.

The Jewish congregation of Charleston, South Carolina, in 1824 made an attempt to solve this crisis by adopting what came to be called « Reform Judaism ». The changes adopted were not very radical, but it was the first rift in the practice of traditional Judaism in the United States. As the century advanced, more Jews, particularly those from Germany where the movement of Reform had received its initial impulses, joined the divergent mode of Judaism. Finally, at Pittsburgh in 1885, at a conference composed of rabbis in America, the Reform put forth a number of its points in what has been called the « Pittsburgh Platform ». While Orthodoxy had placed its stress on the necessity for keeping the ancient traditions in all their exactitude, Reform put its stress on the needs of the people living in present-day America. Reform attacked the concept of the restoration of Israel, the keeping of the Sabbath, the numerous dietary laws, the rite of circumcision, and the retention of Hebrew in synagogue services.

The Orthodox camp, in the main, while loud in their denunciation of the Reform position, preferred to leave the field of battle and cling to their traditions rather than offer anything positive

to solve the problems thrust upon them by American life. Not all the traditionalists acted in this manner, however. A group of able leaders defended traditional Judaism against the radical changes of the Reform. Yet they could not accept the intransigent attitude of the Orthodox; they saw the need for enabling the American Jew to fit in with the American way of life. To get away from the two poles of no-change and too-much-change, these leaders formed a new wing of Judaism intermediate between Orthodoxy and Reform called Conservatism. Strict Orthodoxy opposed this movement as well as the Reform.

The reactionary and separatist attitude of the Orthodox was increased by the influx of a great wave of immigrants from the countries of Eastern Europe at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. Vast groups of Orthodox Jews, after coming to America, settled together in the slums of large cities where they set up synagogues next to their sweatshops as congregations in exile. In this setting they tended to resist change and organization; they desired to establish a pattern of culture and worship that was the equivalent of what they had known in Europe. When the religious functionaries of the synagogue arrived with the training and viewpoint of East European Judaism, a spiritual insulation and isolation set in that was to take years to remove. It is reported that when the rabbi of Slusk came to America and appeared before a meeting of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, he rebuked his audience for having emigrated to this « non-Kosher » land.

Around the turn of the present century, however, Orthodoxy began to awaken. Orthodox leaders, stimulated by the challenges of Reform and Conservative Judaism which they could not ignore, and influenced by the needs of a new generation who were accepting American culture, set themselves to the task of organizing traditional Judaism. They could not and would not, of course, change their ancient heritage, but as they became more American and less European they tended more and more to take into account the American ways of thought, ideals, and life.

In particular the Orthodox began to organize themselves along the patterns set by Reform and Conservative Judaism before them. They established the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary in New York City in 1896 and the Hebrew Theological College at Chicago in 1921 in order to insure well-educated rabbis. In 1898 the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations came into being; and with succeeding years various subsidiary affiliates have been added, especially among the youth. Three conferences of rabbis were established: the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States

and Canada in 1902, currently reported to have 650 members; the Rabbinical Council of America in 1935, now with 660 rabbis; and the Rabbinical Alliance of America in 1944, with a present membership of 500 (1).

These three pillars of Orthodox organization — rabbinical schools, a union of congregations, and conferences of rabbis — are perhaps overshadowed by another organization among the Orthodox of today, the movement known as Young Israel. This had its beginning in New York City in 1912 with the purpose of preserving Orthodoxy and learning. In 1954 it included 70 congregations with a membership of 50,000. The National Council of Young Israel has a number of activities, but its principal one is the promotion of « model » synagogues for the young. More than anything else Young Israel represents the best spirit of modern Orthodoxy in America.

Orthodox Practices

For the Orthodox Jews, the *Torah* describes Judaism as a way of life. Hence, there is a minimum of what to believe, but a maximum of what to do and how to do it. The *Torah,* moreover, is considered as divine guidance or supernatural revelation, not only in the parts taken from the Bible, but in the oral tradition as well. A particularly important source of the oral tradition are the answers of rabbinical authorities to questions on the application of the law of Judaism to changing conditions.

It is impossible, within the confines of this article, to give anything like an adequate account of Orthodox practice. Therefore, selections will be made to give some indication of practice in important areas of Orthodox life.

Worship is the chief function of the Orthodox synagogue. Orthodox Jews pray three times each day, in the morning, at late afternoon, and after sunset. Besides these times, services are held on the Sabbath and on the festivals and holidays. Worship is led by either a cantor or a lay leader of the synagogue, although in modern Orthodoxy, the tendency is to have the synagogue rabbi conduct the services.

The *minyan,* or ten adult male Jews, must be present at the beginning of the reading of the *Torah* to fulfill the requirements. Each of the worshippers has his head covered, with the men wrapping themselves in the *talis* or prayer shawl; during morning

(1) cf. *American Jewish Yearbook,* 1957.

worship, they also put on *tefillin* or phylacteries (small boxes containing quotations from Scripture). In modern American Orthodox synagogues a sermon in English may be given on the Sabbath, but in those with a congregation of foreign background the sermon has little importance. In the latter synagogues addresses are given from the pulpit, but they are in Yiddish and are chiefly for the purpose of raising funds or for the conferring of certain honors or privileges. Hebrew is the exclusive language of prayer, and in the services the women are separated from the men, sitting apart in special pews.

Orthodox Jews keep the Sabbath strictly. They are not allowed to do work of any kind; they cannot even carry on a discussion of weekday affairs. It is forbidden to write, to travel, to carry money. Together with these, there are a number of other prohibitions connected with the Sabbath. It is hard to imagine how they can be kept in all their exactitude. Nevertheless, the ideal of a strict Sabbath is one of the special characteristics of the Orthodox.

Another particular facet of Orthodox life is the keeping of *Kashruth* or dietary restrictions. Jews of strict observance are allowed to eat only « Kosher », or permitted, foods. Reform and Conservative Jews have to a large extent abandoned the keeping of these laws because of the difficulty of observing them in American life, but the special mark of an Orthodox is a careful observance of them. How difficult they are may be seen from the prohibition of eating milk products and meat together. Strictly observant Jews have two sets of dishes, cooking utensils, and tableware to remove the possibility of the contact of the smallest part of the two kinds of food with each other. (2)

The position of women in Orthodoxy is another special mark of that branch of Judaism. According to strict tradition, women must be somehow separated from the main section of the Synagogue which is occupied by the men. Usually this is done by having them sit in the gallery. Women are not allowed any active role in the performance of the rituals; they are not to be present at daily worship and do not actively participate in the Sabbath or holiday services. Their presence is not particularly desirable, and they are not eligible for any of the « honors » in connection with the reading or handling of the sacred scrolls. There is no corresponding ceremony to the *Bar Mitzvah* (coming of age for boys) for

---

(2) Cf. « Dietary Laws » by Simon Cohen in *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia,* Vol. 3, p. 564.

girls, and no arrangements are made for women to study the sacred system. While male Jews are bound by a multitude of observances and prohibitions, women are held to only three formal obligations: following the female ritual purification, lighting the Sabbath candles, and observing the *hallah* (involving the portion of the dough of the Sabbath bread which is dedicated to the Lord).

Yet, along with all these restrictions, Orthodox women have entered the life of the *congregation* through the organization of the ladies auxiliary. In 1923 a Women's Branch of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations was established and now has an imposing membership. Through the auxiliary, Orthodox women carry on many social and educational activities, but typically their organizations have little voice in synagogue affairs.

Problems and Prospects

The position of women in Orthodoxy, so far from that in American life, brings us to a consideration of the problems of Orthodoxy and a few thoughts on the future of this form of Judaism in the United States.

The whole set of strict observances of the Orthodox as well as the quasi-exclusion of women represents a serious and constant threat to the life of Orthodoxy in America. In East European life or where the Jews were more or less isolated within their own special settlements, the practices of Orthodoxy were feasible. However, in American life where the Jews live among and mix so extensively with non-Jews, and where the general conduct of affairs is on a non-Jewish level (the Jews in the United States constitute 3.1% of the total population), the keeping of the Sabbath and the dietary laws, for example, is very difficult. Both Reform and Conservative Judaism have bowed before the incompatibility of traditional practice with modern American life, substituting a Friday evening service for the Sabbath worship and, for all practical purposes, doing away with the dietary laws completely.

A strong characteristic of Orthodoxy, however has always been its intransigence. Modern American Orthodox rabbis have attempted to face the problem of acclimatizing Orthodoxy to America and have succeeded to some extent, but the question of real change is inimical to the strict Orthodox. Theoretically, the way is open by a series of interpretations, applying the principles of the Law to the changed conditions of the Jews in the United States, but opposing such a move is the weight of European tradition which

is still a potent factor in American Orthodoxy. It would seem, too, that many Orthodox still prefer to look backwards with longing toward other days and other lands rather than forward with fortitude to the America of the future.

As a result of such intransigence, the problem of defections is especially grave to the Orthodox. It is very difficult to gather accurate statistics concerning the practice of religion among the Jews in the United States. One author, while decrying the tendency of each of the national synagogue unions to adjust its figures in the light of those published by rival bodies, declares that probably the number of adherents of Reform, Conservatism, and Orthodoxy is roughly similar at present. (3) If we consider that Reform and Conservatism have approximately 700,000 adherents each, (4) the total for all Jewry will bring us in the vicinity of two to two and a half milion. Since there are five million Jews in the United States, this would leave us with the conclusion that approximately three million or at least over half of the Jews in the United States do not have any regular religious affiliation. Furthermore, since the « parent » branch of Judaism in the United States is Orthodoxy, it seems right to conclude that the vast amount of defections have been made from that body of Jewry. Fifty per cent, more or less, of the Jews not regular observants — that is indeed a formidable problem facing Orthodoxy in America!

Yet, it must be said, in favor of Orthodoxy today, that a measure of new life is stirring. Many Orthodox leaders, aware of the problems confronting them, are exercising greater vigor, more care and increased effort to organize and perpetuate Orthodoxy through schools, affiliated organizations, and youth activities. Young Israel in particular is strong in its determination to make Orthodoxy a living religion for the rising generation.

Moreover, Orthodoxy can claim that it, and it alone, is closest to Jewish tradition. To its credit or otherwise, it has not changed, and hence, no matter how much Reform and Conservatism in times past have looked with disfavor upon Orthodoxy, yet at the present time, when there seems to be nostalgia among the Reform particularly but also among Conservatives for things Jewish, the only direction to which they can turn is toward the traditions of Orthodoxy.

What is the future of Orthodoxy? It is hard to tell. If American culture and American secularism take a turn more inimical

---

(3) Marshall Sklare, *Conservative Judaism*, (Glencoe, III., The Free Press, 1955) p. 25.

(4) *Cf. American Jewish Year Book*, 1957.

to the practice of Orthodoxy than in the past, we may well look for new thousands to turn aside from an observant practice of their religion. If Orthodoxy shakes itself and is able to find a better *modus vivendi* in modern American life, a real revival of religion may take place among American Jewry. In any case, it can only be the hope and prayer of Catholics that all Jews find their way to the Fold of their Messiah.

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The unity octave pastoral of his excellency, Bishop François Charrière

Among the different episcopal directives occasioned by the Unity Octave this year, certainly one of the most outstanding was the pastoral letter on Christian Unity issued by His Excellency, François Charrière, Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg. The letter, which was regarded with a good deal of interest in Protestant circles as well, sets out a number of fundamental principles which should serve as effective guides towards the attainment of genuine unity among separated Christian groups. A translation of this important document follows:

Dearly beloved brethren: Quite often in the past we have invited you in an urgent manner to unite yourselves with all those persons of good will who, during the week of January 18th to the 25th, from the feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome to that of the Conversion of St. Paul, pray earnestly for the unity of all Christians and of all believers about Christ and His Church. We are once again making it a point to insist on this matter both because of the necessity of this unity and because of the mistaken perspectives which all too many assume in order to bring it about. Pressing as the duty of seeking unity may be, it would do great harm to a cause that is so essential to all believers if it were to be regarded in a false perspective. To set out upon the wrong road is not to advance; it is in fact to fall back, and all the more so, the faster one were to travel. We believe it to be our duty, then, to appeal here once more to one or the other of those fundamental principles which ought to guide us in so delicate a subject.

We are fully aware that this call to order will not meet with comprehension on all sides; indeed, it will cause pain. In certain quarters, at least, it could be prejudicial to the confidence that many of our separated brethren have placed in us up until the present; but we have always expressed ourselves with great frankness, and our separated brethren prefer that manner of speaking as well.

Faithfulness to the Word of God transmitted by the Church and candidness are indispensable conditions for genuine reconciliation.

The eruption on the world scene over the last century of an aggressive atheism — more precisely, an anti-Christianity — of a revolt against the « God who so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that those who believe in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting » (John III, 16) — this is a phenomenon without precedent in the history of mankind. In his *Aurora,* Nietzsche urged on the several million men « who no longer believe in God » to band together under a sign in order to form a front. This sign has been realized. From now on we have embarked upon a new age where good and evil, truth and error are in marked opposition to each other, are struggling against each other in forms unknown until now. Is there not evident in all of this a most pressing and indisputable invitation addressed to all those throughout the world who believe in a transcendent God to know each other better and to close their ranks? Are they not, after all, unanimous in thinking — to use an expression of Plotinus which Saint Augustine was fond of citing — that « we have a home land from which we have come and a Father who awaits us there »; and also that life here below would be meaningless, and justly absurd, if it were not eventually to open upon that of the next world? Would not their common hope serve as a uplifting force for all of mankind in order to bring it to meet its God and Father? But just how will they be able to unite?

Let us consider first of all the three great religious formations which lay claim to the revelation made to Abraham and which believe in but one God and Creator of the universe, of things both visible and invisible. Must one see in these religions three equivalencies of monotheistic truth? Will it be necessary in the name of the spiritual unity and the peace of future mankind to bring them into a joint action as is proposed by some exponents today, or indeed to amalgamate them, under the supposition that their present divergences are secondary; or else, to go beyond all three and join them together in a fourth formation, superior to each of them, purer than any one of them, a form that would be neither Judaism, nor Christianity, nor Islamism, but into which there would coalesce the complementary aspects and the proper values of Judaism, Islamism, and Christianity?

Yet, is there is single fervent Jew, a single fervent Moslem who would be in accord with this? And what conscientious Christian would give his consent to such a scheme? The Christian knows that since the Fall the whole universe has been « recapitulated » in Christ (Eph. I, 10); that whatever impulses of divine

grace penetrate the formations of Judaism and Islamism come to them as a heavenly ray passing through the Redemption on the Cross; that the adherents of Judaism and of Islam who are of upright heart and docile towards the will of God, although belonging corporally and visibly to their respective religions, yet already belong spiritually and invisibly to Christ and to His Church; that there is no other valid and salutary spiritual unity for men other than that which is realized, visibly or invisibly, about the person of Christ, in whom one day Israel itself will openly recognize its Messias and the Saviour of the world (Rom. XI, 26). The Christian prays that the Judaism of our day and Islamism reach out beyond themselves, that they be freed from their fetters and be receptive to Christianity. He does not ask that Christianity itself abandon its present position; he asks rather for the grace to outstrip his own sinful ways and to render to Christianity, which infinitely excels him, a witness ever less unworthy.

* * *

Let us now, in the light of these principles, examine the division of Christians among themselves. What irreparable harm is done to Christianity when those who come to proclaim it to the nations recognize themselves as separated from one another! How could these nations possibly see its unity? Each of the great religious groups is presented to them: Catholicism, Orthodoxy, Anglicanism, Protestantism; and in addition, there is the disarray caused by the different sects. Ghandi used to say that the only real harm that is done to a religion, whether it be Hinduism, Islam, or Christianity, comes to it not from its adversaries but from the scandal that can be caused by its own adherents. Will it be necessary, then, in order to ward off such scandal, that Christians unite at any cost? How would they be able to do this?

Among those who profess themselves Christians — and here we are limiting ourselves only to those who believe in the divinity of Christ — there are two typically different answers to this question.

There are those who are of the opinion that Christ founded one divine Church. But the sin of men supervened; they have divided that indivisible Church, and reduced it to pieces. They have disputed over its treasures, and each on his own part has appropriated them. Thus it is that in place of the « Church of Christ » we have the « Christian Churches » of today, that is to say, Churches which are equally disunited among themselves, equally separated one from the other. Hence, the way to be followed is

clear. It is to go back to the point from which the descent was made. It would not do for any one of these Churches to invite the others to rejoin it. It is equally the duty of all of them to humiliate themselves, to purify themselves of their sins, and to set out upon the road that will eventually lead to their reunion at a point which is still ahead, over and above each one of them. All of them still retain Christian values, but they represent only branches of the divine Church. All of them must surpass themselves, overcome their differences, and make every effort to reconstruct the true Church of Christ before it is too late — before human history comes to an end and the world passes away. This is how one would have to understand the Saviour's precept on unity: « that they may be one — ut sint unum ».

It goes without saying that such a conception of Christian unity cannot be accepted by a Catholic. Christ is God. He is the Master of time. He founded a Church, *His* Church, which He promised to assist « all days, even to the end of the world » (Matt. xxviii, 20) and « the gates of hell shall not prevail against it » (Matt. xvi, 18). To say that this Church would be shattered, or reduced to segments, would be to belie the prophecy of Christ.

It is true that the sin of men has made itself felt, that there have been divisions, that we find ourselves confronted by Christian Churches which are disunited, separated, and dissentient. There are disunited Churches and the Church from which they disunited, dissentient Churches and the Church from which they dissent. Accordingly, when a Catholic prays that the precept of the Saviour with reference to unity be accomplished, « that they all may be one », the first prayer that his faith suggests to him will be to entreat that the disunited, separated, and dissentient Churches return to the Church from which they disunited, separated, and dissented, that is to say, to the Church founded by Christ, established by Him under the jurisdiction of Peter, and preserved by Him all days, even to the end of time.

We are very well aware that many of our separated brethren, and even some Catholics, consider as irritating these precise appeals of our doctrine. But how can we avoid making them when we see, even among Catholics, a regrettable confusion and a dangerous lack of precision! Dissenting Christians who are irritated by our preciseness believe themselves obliged, moreover, to insist constantly on the impossibility in which they find themselves of envisaging the return to unity as we do. It is painful to us as well to hear it unceasingly claimed that submission to Rome is out of the question. But it is necessary to accept on all sides what we have been saying, provided that it be done not with hatred,

but on the contrary, with sentiments of profound suffering. There are, besides, in our divergences many simple misunderstandings, especially with regard to the meaning to be given to this « return to unity ». We must therefore work without ceasing to dispel them.

* * *

That there are in the separated Churches Christian values which have been conserved and which make up genuine spiritual treasures — of this the Catholic Church is aware. And in this she rejoices, just as she rejoices, without any jealousy, in every good thing, even that which is realized outside her frontiers; for that good is outside the Catholic frame of reference only in appearance; in reality, it belongs to her invisibly. Does not all, in effect, belong to us who are Christ's (I Cor. iii, 23)? The Church is saddened only at the thought that these Christian values are still shackled by the denials and the errors with which they are impeded. She prays that they may one day be unfettered, that they may expand freely and coincide completely with the whole of Christian truth. She hopes for this return en masse with an ardent desire. She prays unceasingly to her Lord and Saviour to hasten that hour of grace when the scandal of separation will come to an end so that the whole world may recognize its Saviour. As long as that is not a reality, something will be lacking; indeed, a good deal will be lacking to the Church of Christ, herself,

Yet what can be lacking to the Church which is *already* one, catholic, and apostolic by her very constitution? There is one aspect under which the Church of Christ is always an *accomplished fact,* and another under which she is always in the *process of becoming.* The whole matter becomes clear when we compare the mystery of the Church to the mystery of the Incarnation. In its essence, in effect, the Incarnation has been realized, and is therefore a fact, from the day of the Annunciation; in the same way, the mystery of the Church as one and Catholic has been in very fact realized from the day of Pentecost. But on the other hand it is correct to say that the mystery of the Incarnation is in progress with reference to its development which is completed only at the Ascension; similarly, as long as there remains but a single human being on this earth who does not belong to her, or who does so but imperfectly, the Church, one and Catholic, will be in the process of becoming, not indeed with regard to her *essence* and her *constitution,* but with reference to her *development* and her *mission.*

We know that the one Catholic Church, entrusted by Christ to Peter, is in a progressive state as far as her extension and her mission are concerned. As long as time shall be and the harvest not ripened, something will be lacking to her, but in the sense in which St. Paul says that something is wanting even to the sufferings of Christ, and that it is necessary for St. Paul himself to fill up this lack in his own flesh for the body of Christ, which is the Church (Col. i, 24).

There is wanting to the divinely established Church, which is one and Catholic, the return to her of all the dissenting Churches. There is lacking in her the *reintegration,* the *reassumption* — this is the sense of the Greek — of the Jewish people. So too is there missing the *advent* to her of Islam and the pre-Christian religions. There is lacking as well the *conversion* of those who at the threshold of our era openly declared war against God and His Christ. But whatever there be of genuine divine life in the separated Churches, in Judaism, in Islamism, in the world, already belongs to her; all that which is true, no matter where, is already Catholic.

There is still something else wanting to the one divinely ordained Church — and extensively so — on the part of only too many of her own children. It is not only to the saints hidden in her midst, but to all of them, that she addresses herself in order to entreat them earnestly, as His Holiness, the Pope, does continually, to take to heart the conversion of the five continents. She implores them to shake off their torpor, their egoism, their shortness of vision, in order to be more alive to the sublime exigencies of the Gospel message; to expend the effort to excel themselves in order to make their minds, their hopes, and their prayers coincide with her own immense desire for the evangelization of the world. She reminds them that they are the messengers of a God « who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth » (I Tim. ii, 4); that they are the disciples of the Saviour who, coming to cast fire on the earth, accepted the bloody baptism of the Cross so that it might be enkindled (Luke, xii, 49-50). Making reference to the words of the second psalm where the Lord says to His Messias, « Ask of me, and I will give thee the gentiles for thine inheritance », Marie of the Incarnation, that remarkable missionary of Canada, supplicated the Heavenly Father finally to do justice to His Son and to give him thus each of the souls of all the people who belong to Him by right, since He redeemed them on the Cross (1). When Catholics pray in this manner, when they experience that holy impatience for the salvation of all

(1) *Écrits spirituels,* Paris, 1930, vol. II, p. 310.

men and for the glory of Christ the Redeemer, they are witnessing to the fact that they truly belong to the only Church which brings with herself the spiritual salvation of the world. But when they instead take refuge in the tranquil and proud possession of their faith and dispense themselves from living it, they are doing incalculable harm to the cause of the reunion of Christians — a fault for which the Saviour will demand an account.

Among those of our contemporaries who mistrust us and who are wary of seeing the influence of the Church asserting itself, there are many in good faith who really feel that we conceive of the return to unity as constituting an absorption, as a command to fall into line, which we are the first to exclude. Where does this idea come from? Certainly, on the one hand, because of a lack of knowledge of our teaching, since it would not be a question of a humiliating return, of a falling into line, but rather of a reconciliation, with all due respect for authentic values and with a profound charity. This reconciliation could be effected not only in the case of isolated persons, but with entire separated communities. Since we are still far from that, we must not further retard this evolution by any hasty and inconsiderate measures which would be disrespectful both to persons and institutions. It is only in an atmosphere of mutual respect that we shall be able to dissipate gradually the misunderstandings which divide us. But it is more than a matter of misunderstanding. Among us Catholics, both of the clergy and of the laity, there is too much discordancy between our faith and our conduct. From there it is but a quick step to the refusal of our separated brethren to give us the benefit of sincerity; and this explains why in certain quarters the Church is looked upon as an enterprise seeking earthly domination, when our kingdom is in reality, as Jesus said, in this world but not of it! Our ideal, to be sure, is so sublime that one will always be able to reproach us for not coming up to it. But would that our contemporaries were at least able to discern in our renewed efforts a sincere will to imitate Our Lord Jesus Christ!

May the Week of Prayer for the spiritual unity of the world in Jesus Christ and through His Church serve as an occasion for us to reflect on our responsibilities and to pray without ceasing so that each one of us may be recognized straightway as a true Christian. This is what we fervently ask for through the intercession of the Virgin Mary, Mother of Jesus and our Mother, the Mother of disunited Christendom. How could she ever fail to be interested in this serious problem since she knows better than we

the frequently prevailing influence of a mother in the all delicate work of reconciliation.

† François Charrière
Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg

★ ★ ★

Some salient features of the 1958 Octave of Prayer for Christian Unity (*)

For the fiftieth time Christians of every confession have observed the Octave of Prayer for Unity. Many intercessory services, solemn liturgies, and Eucharistic supplications were occasioned by this period of prayer, as well as interconfessional meetings and informative conferences. Coming as it does, after the festivities of Christmas, this annual Octave is always a harbinger of peace for men of good will. Falling within the season of Epiphany it recalls the visit of the Magi which symbolizes the union of the East and the West at the feet of the Infant in the Manger. From its very inception, the Octave has been celebrated from the feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome to that of the Conversion of St. Paul; the martyrdom of the two Apostles thus serves as an inspiration to all Christians to render a like witness to the Divine Saviour in prayer and immolation.

It is with gratitude towards God that we recall that the Octave of Prayer for Christian Unity has now completed the fiftieth year of its existence. It was in fact in the year 1908 that this initiative took definite form within the Anglican Communion itself. Its originator, the Reverend Paul Wattson, had received in November of that year a letter from an English fellow minister, the Reverend Spencer Jones, suggesting that the Feast of St. Peter on June 29 be observed as a day of prayer for unity. After a period of reflection and prayer, Fr. Paul replied to the invitation by proposing the Octave formula with which we are now familiar. Thus, the cradle of the Unity Octave was the fervent religious community of the Atonement which Fr. Paul had founded at Graymoor, New York. In launching this enterprise the latter, who a short time later was to enter the Catholic Church, wished to give expression to his unshakeable faith in the merciful omnipotence of Him who is able to overcome the apparently insurmountable obstacles of disunion. In the face of the divisions of Christianity, the Anglican

(*) An abridgement of the original in the French edition of *Unitas* of March-April, 1958.

friar from Graymoor and his confreres in religion wished to rouse the indifference of the great mass of men and to affirm publicly that « nothing is impossible with God ».

This fiftieth anniversary of the Octave was celebrated all over the world. On February 8, the *Osservatore Romano* published an article in which the importance of the jubilee was further emphasized. It indicated at the same time how the Holy See has always favored the development of the great week of prayer for Unity. It was in 1916, in virtue of an apostolic brief, *Romanorum Pontificum,* by Benedict XV, that the movement initiated by Fr. Wattson was extended to the whole Church. The end proposed by the Octave since its inception envisages the return of all separated Christians to the obedience of the Apostolic See, and as such it has been viewed with the greatest interest by the Eastern Rite bishops in communion with Rome. It was because of this interest that in 1922 His Beatitude, the Melkite Patriarch, Mgr. Cadi, the Armenian Archbishop Mgr. Naslian, and the Apostolic Exarch for the Greeks of the Byzantine Rite, Mgr. George Calavassy, presented a petition to Pope Pius XI requesting papal support in a wider diffusion of this initiative in favor of unitive prayer. In the same way, on November 14, 1939, Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church, exhorted the bishops under the jurisdiction of that Congregation to keep the Octave of Prayer in a more solemn manner in their dioceses.

In order to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Octave this year, the Holy Father addressed a letter to Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York (where the mother house of the Society of the Atonement is situated) in which he expressly stated: « We desire, therefore, that this Octave be spread everywhere in the world as far as possible. We desire also that the pious union, ... the League of Prayer for Unity, under the patronage of Our Lady of the Atonement ... may grow day by day in members, imbued with the love of Christ and who will desire nothing more than that all their separated brethren may happily return to the bosom of the Catholic Church. We desire to embrace every one of them, and We pour forth fervent prayers to God that they may return not to the house of a stranger, but to the house of their common Father ».

At Rome, the celebration of the Unity Octave in the Church of Gesù took on a more solemn form for this jubilee year. On the 19th of January, for example, the day dedicated to the return of our separated brethren of the Eastern Rites, the theme was developed with a great deal of refinement by Fr. Joseph Valentini, S. J. of the Catholic University of Milan; while Benediction of the

Blessed Sacrament was imparted by His Eminence, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, assisted by the students of several pontifical seminaries of Eastern Rite: the Armenian, Greek, and Ethiopian Colleges, the Russicum, and the Colleges of St. Josaphat and of St. John Damascene. The closing ceremonies of the Octave were presided over by His Eminence Gregory Peter XV, Cardinal Agagianian, Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenians, having as his assistants the students of the Collegio Propaganda Fide, who represent an ensemble of some forty nationalities. Seminarians from different national colleges from the Old and the New World were also present at the Church of the Gesù on the other days of the Octave in order to take part in the ceremonies and to render the liturgical chant. These evenings of prayer attracted a considerable attendance, with both clergy and laity offering fervent supplications for the unity of Christians.

A further manifestation marked the jubilee of the Octave in Rome; this was an ecumenical exhibition sponsored by the Ladies of Bethany who have the direction of the Foyer Unitas at the Palazzo Salviati. The exposition was inaugurated on January 12 by a conference delivered by Fr. Dunstan Donovan, S. A. in which he paid tribute to the memory of Fr. Paul Wattson, the founder of the Octave of Prayer for Christian Unity. Thanks to their many contacts with our separated brethren, the Ladies of Bethany were able to avert the danger which often besets enterprises of this kind. Too many ecumenical displays content themselves with Catholic testimonials in favor of an interconfessional *rapprochement;* or else, when sponsored by non-Catholics, they present the balance-sheet of Protestant accomplishments alone. But this was far from being the case at Palazzo Salviati where visitors were able to admire both expensive and inexpensive publications, reviews, and bulletins edited by Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans, and Protestants. Thus, most of the denominations were represented in this exposition, the principal purpose of which was to bring together various literary endeavours in the cause of unity. The World Council itself sent a particularly interesting documentation, which in view of various languages employed, was well-adapted to the international character of the groups which frequent the Foyer Unitas.

It would require too much space to enumerate the many centers and organizations represented in the exposition by their bulletins and periodicals. Each of the eighteen countries participating gave ample testimony of the universality of the work for unity.

In an excellent report contributed to *La Croix* of Paris, Msgr. Glorieux makes the happy observation that the multiplicity of

initiatives in favor of Christian unity does not constitute a squandering of effort. This is so, he says first of all, « because each country has its own proper needs and because almost all of the publications have a particular purpose in view; but the principal reason is that the apostolate for Unity is still in its initial stages. The objectives to be attained are immense, and these are to be realized by a charity ever more living and by prayer ever more unanimous. It is important that one be ready to employ every means to this end. »

The field of the press is, in any case, but a very limited sector in ecumenical work. Thus it is that the Foyer Unitas does not content itself with collecting and exhibiting pertinent material; it remains above all a place of prayer and a reception center for our separated brethren who frequent it in large numbers. It is also outstanding for the many conferences and instructive discussions which it sponsors for the purpose of stimulating those who are working and praying for unity. It was fitting, therefore, that the Foyer mark the jubilee of the Octave by a particular manifestation of interest and sympathy for all that is being accomplished in the periodical world for the promotion of ecumenicism.

The Vatican Radio, for its part, once again organized an annual series of allocutions on the subject of Christian unity. These discourses generally concern themselves with the daily intentions of the Octave of Prayer. They are delivered in several languages and consequently offer a great variety of approach. Among the broadcasts in French for this year we should like to single out the address which was dedicated to the Missions and which marked the close of the Octave. Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J., who delivered the address, stressed that the division of Christians was the major obstacle to the spread of the Gospel. « No doubt, » he declared, « non-Catholic missionaries also proclaim Christ; but they are unable to do so without contradicting one or the other of the truths proclaimed by the Catholic missionary. Instead of the co-operation which would insure success, there arise contradiction, scandal, and sterility. The pagan who finds himself sollicited by two opposing doctrines is tempted to choose neither one. To work for the attainment of Christian unity, therefore, is to work simultaneously for the cause of the missions. »

It is with these considerations of such timely interest — they reflect as well the preoccupations of the World Council of Churches — that we wish to terminate this all-too-brief summary of the Octave activity in Rome, the center of Christianity and the See of him who is the successor of Peter and, by the will of Christ, the servant of the servants of God.

The fiftieth anniversary of the Unity Octave was likewise given ample space in the French Catholic newspaper, *La Croix*. In a leading editorial, Fr. Antoine Wenger, A. A. observed: « Christendom this year is marking the Week of Unity in remarkable fashion. Fifty years have in fact passed since its inception. The overall picture for these years has been highly encouraging. And yet, what are fifty in the annals of history? It is quite possible that our epoch which has seen the conquest of celestial spaces may be also the generation which will see the realization of Church unity. »

Emphasizing the great current of charity which is running through the Christian communities, Fr. Wenger adds that this effort for a *rapprochement* « ought to be realized by a striving for truth, the first painful effect of which is to bring into relief the existent divergences, the oppressive heritage of the last centuries, of old quarrels, and of the sins of men. » This editorial by a theologian who is attentive to the needs of the times, inaugurated an impressive series of meaty studies on ecumenical problems. It may be said, in fact, that *La Croix* is the only daily newspaper which offers us both an extensive and impartial information on all that is being done throughout Christendom in the domain of unity. During the Octave the newspaper published a succession of different viewpoints on the progress of ecumenism and the situation of the separated denominations. The articles by Fr. François Bernard, director of the religious page, Charles Monsch, Charles Ehlinger, Louis Bouyer, Msgr. Glorieux, John Dingle, Aimée Bazy, Jean Pelissier, and Professor Joannides illustrated the different intentions of the Week of Prayer and described the actual situation of our separated brethren. An evident regard for doctrinal study was characteristic of these articles. This very important aspect of the quest for unity was particularly brought to the fore in a short essay by Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J., president of the International Unitas Association. After exhorting Catholics to prayer and to sacrifice — in a word, to do more for Christian unity — the author develops his considerations in such a convincing manner that we should like to reproduce them here in their entirety:

> It is not a question, he writes, of denying the progress already made. This very month marks a period of fifty years that Christians of various denominations, in ever increasing numbers, have directed their prayers to the One Shepherd to bring them together again into one fold. Such prayer could not remain without effect. The Ecumenical Movement likewise has been in existence for fifty years, and during this time

non-Catholic Christians have been trying to fashion the unity which they recognize as belonging to the Church of Christ.

Theologians of the separated East who formerly were intent on ammassing accusations against the theologians of the West, willingly acknowledge today that at bottom there is only one real point of separation — that of the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

Often enough one may read in Protestant publications assertions which are properly Catholic and which, in fact, find their complete harmonization only within a Catholic context. Thus, Protestant writers may speak of real and interior justice succeeding to the state of sin; they recognize the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, and even a transubstantiation; they admit as well a power which is reserved to the authorized ministers of Christian worship. While appealing to the sole authority of the Bible, they also accept a certain tradition and even a legitimate development of divine revelation. Certain Protestants go even further and speak almost like Catholics about confession, of virginity, and of the Mother of God; while among Anglicans some very High Church members acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope.

It is evident, finally, that on a fairly large scale, Catholics and non-Catholics live in a more tranquil atmosphere in which mutual discussion is possible; this, in fact, has been both frequent and profitable.

Despite these factors, however, divisions still persist. A certain understanding, a number of mergers of related denominations, the elimination of some long-standing prejudices, — all this is indeed considerable. Yet it does not constitute unity. Only those individuals could be satisfied with such a state of affairs who are content with a unity at a reduced price, either because they deem it sufficient or because they think it the only kind possible. But genuine unity requires that those who make it up profess the same faith, participate in the same worship, and are subordinate to the same hierarchy. It is in this way that the Church of Rome is one, and she alone. The Churches of the East which reject the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome and the Protestant communities which uphold a different doctrine are simply outside this unity. Christians will not attain to unity except by reunion with the Church of Rome. Such is our Catholic faith, and this we can neither change nor dissimulate.

If we consider the present situation in the light of this, we can distinguish three separate standpoints among non-

Catholic Christians. A small number among them explicitly desire reunion with the Church of Rome and submission to the Pope, but they do not see the necessity of realizing this. Such, for example, was the case with Fr. Paul Wattson fifty years ago when he began the Octave for Unity in order that Anglicans might accept the supremacy of the Pope; he himself did not ask to be received into the Catholic Church until more than a year later. This was more particularly the case with his colleague, Spencer Jones, a clergyman who wrote eloquently in favor of a return to Rome; yet he himself died an Anglican at the age of eighty-six. This same attitude is to be found among the « Papalists » of today.

A different viewpoint is that of those who are looking for unity without being convinced that it is that of the Catholic Church, although they do not exclude the possibility of this. Finally, the greater number more or less resolutely exclude adherence to the teaching of the Roman Church and submission to her authority. Those who make up this group are in fact renouncing the possibility of attaining the unity of faith, since they are rejecting the only way in which it is possible.

One can readily see from this brief account what profound interior changes are demanded by that unity for which we are praying to Him who is the master of our souls. The division of Christians is a great evil. The remedies which the Ecumenical Movement has sought to apply up to the present are welcome, but they are still weak; they do not even prevent the spread of further division, since the World Council of Churches, for the most part Protestant in character, but created with a view to achieving unity, will become more and more the promoter of non-Catholic missions.

Only one conclusion remains possible: the Ecumenical Movement must be intensified and directed towards genuine unity. We must pray more, and we must work harder. Historians and theologians must make resplendent the titles of the Roman Catholic Church to men of good will. Every fervent soul should be sollicited to pray, ever more intensely and constantly, for a new divine effusion of light and of strength. Certainly, our efforts will not fail to be rewarded by Him who has said: « Other sheep I have that are not of this fold. Them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd. » (St. John, X, 16).

This resolute faith in the efficacy of prayer animates all those who are dedicated to a *rapprochement* of Christian groups. As Fr. Michalon so well reminds us in *La Croix,* it was to the great merit of Fr. Paul that he placed all his hopes in the efficacy of prayer. It was also to the credit of Abbé Couturier to have wished that this prayer be both unanimous and fraternal. By his providential action, this saintly priest exhorted Christians to unite their humble supplication to the priestly prayer of Our Lord. Incorporated by Baptism into Christ, they were to pray for each other to the One who sanctifies them with His grace and impetrate that unity which the Lord wills and by the means which He wills — in accordance with the prayer of the liturgy: « Deign, Lord Jesus, to grant to Thy Church that peace and unity which are agreeable to Thy will. »

It was this same appropriate prayer that Fr. Paul Wattson had already recommended to the Swedish Lutheran minister, Dr. Rosendahl. In making this proposal, Fr. Paul wished to suggest to him a formula of prayer in keeping with his belief. For it goes without saying that separated Christians always pray in accordance with their faith and the faith of their church. Such, in fact, is the greatest tragedy of division: that of not being able to pray in the same manner. It is the realization of this which causes pain and calls forth sacrifice on the part those who devote themselves to the quest for unity. Yet we know that this pain is redemptive; it confers its efficacy on ecumenical prayer in so far as it is linked with the supreme sacrifice of Christ on the cross. To the degree in which this prayer is ecumenical, so does it permit itself to be formulated by each one according to the language of his own communion. It is irenical and beneficial only in the measure in which it acknowledges its relationship (more than just a proximity) to another prayer which is inspired by the same love for the whole Christ. For Christians, the essential thing is to pray with fervor and with disinterestedness in accordance with their conscience and their faith. But still more must they acknowledge the obligation of praying in unanimity. Inspired by God, the saintly Abbé Coutourier was able to encourage and to convince them of this. His humility and his penitential spirit bestowed a new savour on his message. His appeal has created a movement of spiritual emulation which joins together in a common hope those who sincerely aspire to correspond to the designs of Our Lord who prayed for the unity of his followers.

We should like to cite here an instance or two of the homage rendered to the humble priest from Lyons. In *Le Monde* for January 17, for example, we find an article by the French Reformed

minister, Roger Mehl who outlines the history of the Universal Week of Prayer:

> The movement, he writes, owed its beginnings to the initiative of two Anglican clergymen, Spencer Jones and Lewis Thomas Wattson, the second of whom was eventually to become a convert to Catholicism. This endeavor was to find a very profound echo among the monks of the Benedictine Priory of Amay-sur-Meuse, in Belgium. It was there that a humble priest from Lyons, Abbé Couturier, whose career as a college professor possessed nothing of the spectacular, discovered his vocation as an apostle of unity. Henceforth he was to consecrate all his efforts, even to his last breath, with a paucity of material means, to promoting this Week of Prayer for Unity in all the different sectors of Christianity. His aim was to engage all the Christian confessions in the way of a « spiritual emulation » with a view towards constituting an « invisible monastery of prayer. » He thus multiplied his contacts with Orthodox, Anglicans, and Protestants.
>
> But how are we to pray for unity in the truth when there are separations, when unity is not conceived in the same manner, when some believe that the question is purely and simply the return of separated Christians to Rome; while others, on the contrary, feel that unity can only be realized within a restored and a reformed Church, without any submission to a visible head of the Church? What is the significance of a prayer animated by intentions which are so rigorously contradictory? Is there not an evident risk of insincerity? Abbé Couturier had too delicate a conscience not to perceive these danger points. His religious genius lay in recognizing that prayer is a possibility offered to men over and above every contradiction. First of all, he understood that unity could only be the fruit of a greater consecration of each Christian to the heart of his own confession, and that under these conditions it was perfectly possible and desirable that Christians learn to pray for each other. But, above all, conscious of the supernatural character of the unity of the Church, he saw that the spirit of the faithful should not be aimed at the different conceptions of unity, but that they should be called upon to pray quite simply for that unity « which the Lord wills and by the means which He wills. »

In *Le Figaro* for January 25th, Pastor Boegner, president of the ' Federation protestante de France ', likewise extolls the results

obtained through the Week of Prayer for unity on the plane of charity and of mutual comprehension:

> The Week which has just come to a close, he writes, has seen Christians from all over the world, belonging to the most diverse confessions, come together to beseech God to hasten the day when Christian unity, realized invisibly in the communion of saints, may become a visible reality for believers as well as for unbelievers. Doubtless there are some who think that there has scarcely been any change since the Week of Prayer for Unity came into being; but that is a serious mistake. Prepared for by that intercessory prayer, reconciliations, regroupings, and organic unions between confessions heretofore separated have come about here and there. Better still a new atmosphere has been created to which few churches can remain indifferent — an atmosphere of respect and of reciprocal understanding, of ecumenical fervor, and of fraternal love.

It is certain that the great week of intercession this year has witnessed a renewal of fervor which, in part at least, must be attributed to the celebration of the jubilee year. In France, both the small country parishes and the convents of Sisters willingly associated themselves with the universal prayer of Christendom. Among these manifestations, we must place in the first rank the intense supplications welling forth from contemplative monasteries and convents. Certainly our separated brethren can appreciate the primordial role played by these dedicated men and women of all confessions in a domain of such importance.

It is a source of gratification to know that the large cities were favored by fraternal meetings and by many informative conferences. The well-planned program prepared by Bishop Rupp for the Parisian area was, as we know, given a wide publicity in the press. In Lyons, at a meeting held under the joint presidency of Cardinal Gerlier and the Reverend Francis House, the principal address was given by Fr. Cwiertniak. From Lyons, too, many thousands of copies of tracts on the subject of unity were sent out by Fr. Michalon.

In Belgium prayer services, conferences, and appropriate sermons took place in all the important centers. At the Louvain foyer at Aucam an interesting lecture was given by Anglican, the Rev. F. P. Colman, while at Liege an interconfessional meeting was presided over by the Bishop of the city. As part of its participation in the Octave observance, the Unitas center at Bruxelles distributed more than fifty thousand attractively printed leaflets.

In Switzerland, the appeal launched by the Commission on Faith and Order met with a faithful response on the part of the 169 member churches of the World Council. On the Catholic side a pastoral letter of Mgr. François Charrière, bishop of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg, was read in all the churches of the diocese during the Octave. (1)

The depth of the teaching proposed to us in this pastoral is allied to a perfect irenicism; nothing clearer nor more judicious has ever been written on the norms which should guide our relations with our separated brethren.

In Great Britain Catholics celebrated the Octave this year with particular fervor. Mgr. Godfrey, the Archbishop of Westminster, marked the opening of the week by preaching at the London Convent of Notre Dame de Sion, while at Westminster Cathedral Fr. Bede MacEachen of the Society of the Atonement led the recitation of the prayers for unity each evening after the solemn Mass. At Leeds, Bishop Dwyer authorized his clergy to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice on each evening of the Octave. Meanwhile, at an interconfessional meeting in Birmingham, the first of its kind there, some two thousand people came together at Central Hall to hear the Catholic Abbot of Downside, an Anglican clergyman, and a Free Church minister. At this very successful gathering there were present the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham and Lord Norton, a former president of the English Church Union. Following the meeting, Mr. Barwell, its chairman, declared: « The atmosphere was excellent, and we are hoping to begin again next year. » At Birmingham, too, Catholics were active in organizing impressive prayer services at their Oratory at Egbaston. In the small parishes of the English countryside, the Octave was observed with fervent interest as well. Thus, at Wallington and at Surrey the rosary was recited in common for our separated brethren.

In Germany, among many other notable activities in connection with the Unity Octave, the pastoral letter of Mgr. Jaeger, Archbishop of Paderborn, aroused widespread interest.

These few citations can give but an approximate idea of the manifestations of an Octave that was particularly fervent. In its summary of the Week of Christian Unity, however, the Ecumenical Press Service bulletin gives expression to the complaints made in certain countries regarding the intentions proposed by the Catholic Church during the Octave. It is quite certain that very

---

(1) An English translation of this letter appears elsewhere in this issue of *Unitas*.

many of faithful prayed for the return of their fellow Christians to the Church of Rome. Yet it is hardly probable that these Catholics were moved by the kind of proselytism which the E. P. S. publication deplores. In fact, they look upon the return of their separated brothers as the coming back to a home which is theirs by right and — to use expression of His Holiness — as the access to the house of the common Father and not that of a stranger. « Return » conotes neither defeat, nor the denial of authentically Christian values, nor the absorption of one church by another, but the accession to and the realization of Christianity in all its fullness. When a Catholic prays expressly for the return of his fellow Christians, he is praying in accordance with his faith, Those who are separated from us know that the faith of a Catholic obliges him to consider the Church of Rome as the true Church founded by Christ in which the unity willed by the Saviour has been realized. Hence, by praying as did Fr. Paul Wattson, the founder of the Octave, he is not doing so out of confessional pride but is simply witnessing to his faithfulness to Christ who has incorporated him into His true Church without any merit on his own part. How can the return to Unity be considered a personal triumph or as the triumph of one communion over another when it is in reality the victory of Christ in all of us who love Him and who claim to be His?

The view expressed in the Ecumenical Press Bulletin leads us to repeat that during the Octave Christians should pray in the light of their faith and according to the language of their church. Provided that it be fervent and unanimous, persevering and disinterested, such prayer will not fail to be the providential means which will hasten the miracle that all of us are awaiting.

JEROME CORNÉLIS, A. A.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Unity Octave Widely Celebrated

As the documentary part of this issue of Unitas *indicates, the fiftieth anniversary of the Octave of Prayer for Unity was observed far and wide this year with unusual interest and fervor. From the United States, where the Octave was inaugurated by Fr. Wattson of the Society of the Atonement, to India and Japan, prayer services and other activities reflected the world-wide attention which the Octave has awakened over the past fifty years of its existence. It would require far too much space even to attempt a listing of these endeavors in the interest of unity, and for that reason in this number of our review we have limited ourselves to citing one or the other of the more salient events in connection with the* 1958 *Octave.*

Certainly, it must be said that this past half century has seen a remarkable change in the relations between separated Christian groups, and the concern over the problem of disunity has become ever deeper and more universal. While it is impossible to say just to what extent the January Octave has contributed to this unity consciousness, yet it would be reasonable to maintain that the many sincere prayers which it has occasioned over the years have had a great deal to do with bringing this about.

* * *

Archbishop of Milan again Urges Octave Observance

Continuing a policy that he has followed since becoming Archbishop of Milan, His Excellency Giovanni B. Montini in a pastoral letter early this year urged the Catholics of his archdiocese to a sincere participation in the Unity Octave. While pointing out the thorny problems that have persisted in the quest for unity, Mgr. Montini nevertheless held out hope for eventual success.

« Looking back over the last fifty years since this Octave for Unity has been celebrated, » wrote Archbishop Montini, « and reflecting on the persistent difficulties of the problem, one would

be tempted to believe it impossible of being settled and vain the effort of prayer for its solution. What advantages have been obtained? Are we not perhaps at the same point where we started from? Does not experience tell us that the return of our separated brethren is out of the question?

« This weighty objection should not intimidate us, however. It is not true, in any case, that nothing has been gained: a more widely diffused awareness of the problem has come about, and this now makes up part of the present consciousness of the Church and informs her spirituality; we see about us, too, the good will of resolving that problem, by removing little by little the psychological obstacles which render it unsolvable and by preparing a new attitude of mind to study it, to smooth the way for the return of our separated brethren, and to dispose those of the household of the Faith to await and to welcome with Christian joy their much-desired coming; finally, there is extant a very important thing — hope, an element that we must never allow to become extinguished. »

* * *

Octave Speakers Advocate Intelligent and Understanding Attitude towards Other Faiths

An intelligent and sympathetic attitude toward Protestantism and other non-Catholic religions was urged by two Catholic priests at the Chair of Unity Octave observance in Washington in January.

A policy of charity and understanding on the part of Catholics with regard to their separated brethren was called for by Father Eric McDermott, S. J., professor of history at Georgetown University; and Father Angelus F. Delahunt, Superior General of the Society of the Atonement, Graymoor, Garrison, N. Y. They spoke at the eight-day series of services at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception on the grounds of the Catholic University of America.

Father McDermott urged intelligent approach toward the views of modern-day Protestants. « Far too easily, » he said, « we lamentably underrate Protestant intelligence and zeal, obsessed as we are with Protestants of straw who lack any living counterparts. Those Catholics, especially, who make a serious study of philosophy or theology need to have a clear knowledge of the present views of contemporary Protestants, and not merely the obsolete views of the 16th century. »

The Jesuit historian exhorted Catholics to add to their prayers for further Protestant progress toward Christian unity « words of thanksgiving to God for so much change favorable to Catholicism

in the intellectual atmosphere of modern Protestantism. » He said further that Catholics should not concentrate solely on what Lutherans and other Protestants should do in this matter of unity.

« We must also turn our attention to ourselves, » he declared, « and resolve that our attitude toward our Protestant friends will try to be appreciative of their religious thoughts and aware of their spiritual achievements and their needs. If we understand them, we may love them. Without love both of God and of our fellow men there is no Christianity in this world nor salvation in the next, » Father McDermott concluded.

Fr. Angelus Delahunt, S. A., preached at a Pontifical Mass offered by Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle of Whashington. He said that there must be a steadfast position in regard to the Church's teaching, but an attitude of charity and courtesy toward those of other religions.

« In this great work of reunion, we cannot water down Christ's teaching, » he stated. « But while we cannot compromise the position of the Church, remember that there is no room in the apostolate for rudeness, lack of sympathy or kindness toward our separated brethren. » (*NC*)

* * *

Interdenominational Meetings on Unity Held at London and Birmingham

A regular event in connection with the January week of prayer for unity in England has been the interconfessional meeting at St. Pancras Town Hall. This year the meeting was presided over by the Anglican Bishop of Guildford, Dr. Ivor Watkins, while the other principal speakers on the program were: Reverend Donald Pilkington of the Roman Catholic Westminster Cathedral; Mr. John Lawrence, editor of the Anglican journal *Frontier;* and Dr. Ronald Spivey of the Methodist Church.

Dr. Watkins in his address emphasized that unity could be obtained neither by pretence nor by short cuts. « The only method that will lead us towards unity, » he declared, « demands frankness and honesty with each other in the spirit of true love and charity. The thing that divides Christians is not a question of rites and ceremonies, but the doctrine of the Church. When the history of this period of the Church is written, it will be found that in this movement towards unity, Christian bodies were forced to study afresh that doctrine. If this movement does just that, it will have done a very great deal. »

Mr. John Lawrence, in his discourse, said that a deep reverence for all the views of the Church followed from the consideration that the Church and its unity were mysteries. « The Holy Spirit does guide us, » he continued, « and if we do not approach the question of unity with a repentant mind, we cannot make one inch of progress. We are on a dark road searching for the unity of the Church. We are given enough light to enable us to take the next step, and it comes to us every day. »

In his turn, Father Ronald Pilkington presented his listeners with a survey of Roman Catholic organizations which are actively engaged in ecumenical work. Most of these, he explained, are to be found in Italy, France, and Germany; and one of their principal objectives is to overcome the barriers which separate Christians of the East and West.

« In making enquiries about the societies engaged in oecumenical work, » declared Father Pilkington, « I have been uplifted, consoled, and encouraged by the volume of prayer going up from those organizations and from organizations not in communion with the Roman Catholic See. We know that in God's good time, something will be achieved. Such goodwill and devotion cannot remain rootless. »

As the final speaker, Dr. Ronald Spivey stressed the importance of mutual charity among Christians as the great hope of reunion. « The truly Catholic spirit, » he affirmed, « is the spirit of charity. It is not one of indifference to doctrine. Unity will not come from theological compromise, or from the committee room of the ecclesiastical engineers. Nor will it come by enforcing identical ways of worship. Unless we get to know people of other denominations, we shall never understand the real need for the unity of Christ's Church. »

At another meeting at Birmingham, a large audience of some 2000 people heard addresses relating to Christian unity delivered by Dom Basil Butler, Roman Catholic Benedictine Abbot of Downside, the Reverend Raymond E. Raynes of the Anglican Community of the Resurrection, and the Reverend Kenneth Slack, general secretary of the British Council of Churches. (*Ch. Times*)

* * *

New Book Issued at Close of Octave Discusses Unity Prospects

Although the reunion of Christendom seems remote, recent developments in Protestant groups encourage the hope that such unity will be achieved, according to a new book by William J. Wha-

len, assistant professor of English at Purdue University. Entitled *Separated Brethren* and released by the Bruce Publishing Company, the book is the result of ten years of research in the field of comparative religion and presents a survey of non-Catholic religions, their tenets and history.

According to Mr. Whalen, large groups of Protestants now view the Catholic Church in a more favorable light. They regard the present division of Christendom as a calamity and not a badge of honor or a triumphant individualism.

Citing the changing attitude of Protestants as the bright hope for eventual unity, the book notes that recent trends in Catholic thought have also helped to narrow the gulf between divided groups. It mentions the increased activity and responsibility of the laity, wider use of the vernacular in the liturgy, simplification of rubrics, and congregational singing as helpful steps toward achieving Church unity. (*NC*)

* * *

Catholic and Protestant Scholars Meet for Discussion at Loccum

Having as its general topic « Ecumenism and Catholicism », an interesting meeting of Catholic and Protestant scholars took place at the Evangelical Academy at Loccum, Germany, early in March. Rev. Francis House, associate general secretary of the World Council of Churches, described the discussions as « frank and hard-hitting, but none the less friendly » and said that key points of reference centered about « the deepest theological differences between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. »

An intensive study of the 17th chapter of the Gospel of St. John was conducted alternately at the meeting by a Catholic priest and a Protestant pastor, and it was unanimously agreed that more should be done to stir up interest and prayer for the cause of unity among the Christian laity. On each evening of the conference, the delegates came together in the abbey church for the singing of the office of Compline in common.

Among those in attendance at the Locum meeting were: Dr. Thomas Sartory, O.S.B., editor of the Catholic ecumenical review *Una Sancta;* Professor Johann Baptist Hirschmann, S. J., of Frankfurt, and Dr. Albert Brandenburg of the Johann Adam Möhler Institute at Paderborn. On the Protestant side, speakers included: Professor Karl Gerhard Steck of Frankfurt, Professor D. Heinz-Horst Schrey of Berlin, and Dr. Hans Bolewski, director of the Loccum Academy.

It will be recalled that early in the 18th century the Abbey of Loccum was the setting for discussions between Lutherans and Roman Catholics with a view to restoring unity between them. Among the well-known figures participating in that meeting were Bossuet, Leibniz, and Molanos, the Protestant abbot of Loccum. (*EPS*).

* * *

Noted French Bishop Discusses Problem of Disunity at Notre Dame Cathedral

During the course of his Lenten series at Notre Dame in Paris this spring, Mgr. Emile Blanchet, rector of l'Institut catholique, devoted the fifth of his conferences to the problem of Christian disunion.

The Church willed by Christ, declared Bishop Blanchet, is « the house built upon a rock — not the tent quickly erected and quickly rolled up which one brings away with him along a road chosen at will; it is not the refuge of nomads, today put together and tomorrow dispersed; rather it is a well assembled and solid abode, built to endure and where generation will succeed generation ... »

The New Testament, affirmed Mgr. Blanchet, proclaims the necessary unity of the Kingdom, of the flock led by the one Shepherd. There is to be but one teaching, one Master alone, but one Christianity. And yet Christians offer the world the spectacle of their divisions.

Retracing with both force and depth the broad lines of history, the speaker brought into relief the two cataclysms which were the Greek Schism in the Middle Ages and the Protestant Reformation in the century of the Renaissance. Here he skillfully disengaged the causes of our divisions: in the midst of social and political upheavals, men through their own fault were unable to dominate the events around them. If Protestantism was born, who would dare say that Catholics were not in part responsible? The Fathers of the Council of Trent solemnly acknowledged this. But how had Luther forgotten the words of St. Augustine: « But why have those who are our brothers separated themselves from us? Let them tell us why. Is it because the bishops were evil? But they were in legitimate possession of their sees; they were occupying them in the name of Christ. There was no reason for them to sever themselves from unity. »

But once the rupture was complete, the crumbling of separated

elements, even against the will of the reformers, showed the extent of their error. « One does not reform the Church by leaving it. »

Mgr. Blanchet next laid emphasis upon the spiritual treasures conserved by our separated brethren and made his listeners aware of the great movement towards unity which is exerting its influence on so many Christians of our day. To be sure, the Church cannot, without contradicting herself, form part of the 'round table' of the World Council of Churches; this is not pride on her part, but rather a humble submission to divine and to human reality.

The rector of l'Institut catholique concluded his conference by urging Catholics to make their faith known by their life and action. Love, he said, is also a light and should lead to humble prayer. « Let us, then, cast our efforts, as a generous gesture, on the Providence of God, just as one casts grain on the earth in confident expectation; and may God, who is present to all human endeavor, cause the harvest to be reaped in the fullness of time. » (*La Croix*)

* * *

IMC Assembly Approves Plan of Merger with World Council of Churches

Meeting at Achimota in Ghana during the first week in January, delegates of 35 member groups of the International Missionary Council voted in favor of a draft plan of integration with the World Council of Churches. It will be remembered that the Central Committee of the World Council also had voted approval of the plan at its meeting in New Haven in August of last year.

Just as at New Haven, so at Achimota, misgivings were felt on the part of some of the delegates about an eventual merger on the part of these two world groups. The objections at Ghana arose mostly from the side of Fundamentalist groups making up part of the IMC and from local African communities. The proposal was likewise disapproved by delegates from France, Mexico, Norway, and Sweden. When the final vote was taken, however, the majority of those present approved the plan of merger by fifty-eight to seven.

The sense that the project of integration between the two Councils was not sufficiently spontaneous is reflected in a report by a correspondent to the *Church of England Newspaper*. « The Assembly (at Achimota) », he wrote, « was permeated by a feeling of sadness. There was no such feeling of exhilaration as that with which we left Tabaram in 1935 and Whitby in 1947, for there were many unresolved contradictions in opinion, too many unanswered questions, and no real freedom of spirit with one another.

« The feeling was that many things had been carefully prepared in New York and sprung on the Assembly ready-made, with no real opportunity for patient thought. The Assembly has led to no great new insight and to no great challenge to the Christian world. »

As matters now stand, the draft plan will be the subject of special study by the member councils for the next two years. It will also require further examination by members of the World Council, and for this reason it is foreseen that the next General Assembly of the W.C.C. will be postponed an extra year until 1961 in order to allow for more study and discussion of the merger plan.

* * *

Executive Committee of the World Council Meets in London

The winter meeting of the Executive Committe of the W.C.C. was held this year in London from February 10 - 14. The Committee meets regularly twice a year to review the activities of the World Council and to discuss matters of policy.

At its session in London, the twelve members who make up the Committee gave their consideration to various subjects of special interest to the World Council, among them being: a proposed meeting with representatives of the Moscow Patriarchate in August; the difficult situation of the churches in East Germany and Hungary; plans for the purchase of a permanent site for W.C.C. headquarters in Geneva; relief work in the Middle East and aid to refugees; and plans for the next meeting of the Central Committee at Nyborg Strand in Denmark from August 21 - 29.

In his report covering the period of the last six months, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the W.C.C., declared that the active focal points of the Ecumenical Movement had been most in evidence at the Faith and Order Conference at Oberlin, Ohio, last September, at the East Asia Christian Conference, and at the recent All Africa Church Conference in Nigeria. (*EPS*)

Dr. G. K. A. Bell Lectures on Lambeth Conference

The Foyer Unitas at Palazzo Salviati in Rome served as the setting recently for an interesting lecture on the Lambeth Conference by the retired bishop of Chichester, Dr. G. K. A. Bell.

Dr. Bell, who had previously visited Athens before coming to Rome, was introduced by Fr. Charles Boyer S. J. In the course

of his lecture, he traced the origin and development of the Lambeth Conferences and stressed particularly the significance of the attention given by the Anglican bishops to questions relating to Christian unity.

At the close of the lecture, Dr. Bell answered various questions put to him from the audience on matters connected both with the Lambeth Conference and the World Council of Churches, of which he is an honorary president.

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Radio Message by Pope Pius Inaugurates Lourdes Centenary

A message by Pope Pius XII, emanating from Rome, to pilgrims assembled at Lourdes marked the opening of the first centenary of the apparitions of the Blessed Virgin Mary to St. Bernadette. Broadcast over the Vatican Radio on February 11, the message of the Holy Father read as follows:

« To you, beloved pilgrims of Lourdes, who will have the privilege of kneeling before the Grotto of Massabielle at the very hour of the centenary of the first apparition of the Immaculate Virgin to Bernadette, and likewise to all of you, beloved children, who in your own countries near and far will in your prayers unite yourselves to the inaugural festivities of this jubilee year, we address this Message with a heart full of joy and supernatural hope. Indeed, it is not without emotion that We invoke that memorable day of February 11, 1858, proclaimed in the liturgy of the Church: « Today the glorious Queen of Heaven has appeared on earth; this day she has brought to her people words of salvation and pledges of peace » (Office of the feast, ant. *ad Magnificat*).

« In view of the many favors lavished upon this hallowed place for a hundred years, let your hymn of thanksgiving rise with Ours to the throne of Divine Mercy. Hearken to the appeal of Mary by your works of penitence and charity, by that personal and collective reform which We have recommended to you. May a unanimous resolution lift up your hearts and carry them on to a faithful observance of the precepts of the Saviour; may prayer be lifted up everywhere to God for the Church, for her liberty in those places where oppression rages, for her extension to all nations, and for the peace of the world. May the infirm join to their prayers the generous offering of their sufferings, and the souls of Religious the voluntary immolation of their consecrated lives. To all, We impart wholeheartedly, as a pledge of the numerous graces which We are expecting from this Marian Jubilee, Our very paternal apostolic benediction. »

Pope Commends Franciscans for Chinese Translation of the Gospels

His Holiness Pope Pius XII, in a letter written by Mgr. Angelo Dell'Acqua, of the Vatican Secretariate of State, has congratulated the Franciscan Fathers for a translation of the Gospels into Chinese.

The letter, sent to Father Augustine Sepinski, Superior General of the Friars Minor, praised the translation made by Franciscan Fathers of the Biblical Center in Hong Kong. The letter read in part:

« The Holy Father expressed words of satisfaction and good wishes for a work which can be so useful to the propagation of the Catholic faith and of the religion of Christ in China. It cannot fail to yield benefical results, offering to many hearts the message of salvation and peace. » (*Oss. Romano*)

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

Fordham Conference Dedicated to Problems of Eastern Rite Catholics

A discussion of the position occupied by Eastern Rite Catholics in the American way of life was the principal topic of the twentieth Annual Conference on Eastern Rites and Liturgies held at Fordham University in New York in the latter part of March.

Jesuit Father Joseph Fitzpatrick, Fordham sociologist, spoke on the position of Eastern Rite Catholics as a minority group in the United States and their problems of survival in American society. His address was followed by a discussion period which was led by Redemptorist Father Clement G. Englert of the Fordham Institute of Russian Studies, and Father Paul Dano, pastor of St. Mary's Greek Catholic Church in New York City.

A further discussion period followed the reading of a paper by the Reverend Victor J. Posphshil, J.C.D., entitled, « Parish Participation. » The panel for this topic was composed of the Right Rev. Stephen Stepanian, the Right Rev. George Babutiu, the Very Rev. John Krimm, and the Rev. Allen Maloof.

The three-day Conference was climaxed on March 22 with a concelebration of the Divine Liturgy in the Byzantine-Ruthenian Rite in St. Patrick's Cathedral at which His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York presided.

The concelebrants of the Liturgy were from St. George's Ukrai-

nian Catholic Church in New York, and included Father Nicholas Kohut, Provincial of the Order of St. Basil the Great. Unlike the Latin Rite, which, except at the ordination of priests or the consecration of a bishop, permits only one priest at a time to offer Mass before a single altar, it is customary in the Eastern Rites for a number of priests to concelebrate the Divine Liturgy jointly.

The Fordham Conference was founded in 1938 by a group of Fordham University students to acquaint Catholics of the Latin Rite with the various liturgies and customs of the Eastern rites. It has been decided that the original purpose has been accomplished, and the Conference now aims at bringing Latin and Eastern Catholics together for a discussion of common problems. Msgr. Peter P. Tuohy, national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, was chairman of the opening session of this year's meeting, while the Rev. J. Franklin Ewing, S. J. chaired the second. (*NC*)

Paulist Fathers Observe Centenary of Foundation

The Society of St. Paul the Apostle, the first Catholic religious community of priests founded in the United States, is observing this year the first centennial of its foundation. It was in New York on July 7, 1858, that Fr. Isaac Hecker, a convert to the Catholic Church from a Lutheran and Methodist background, formally brought into being the Society which he dedicated to the winning of America to the Catholic faith.

Father Hecker, as a member of the Redemptorist community, was ordained by Bishop Wiseman in London in 1849, following studies in Belgium, Holland, and England. After his return to the United States, it became clear in time that God was calling him to do a more specific work in the apostolate, and thus with the encouragement of Pope Pius IX he was led to initiate a new community in the Church in 1858. As collaborators in his enterprise, Father Hecker had Fathers Walworth, Hewit, Deshon, and Baker, all of them converts to the Catholic faith.

An able speaker, writer, and organizer, Father Hecker was active in bringing the Christian message to large segments of the population by means of the printed word (he founded the *Catholic World* and the Paulist Press) and by well-planned missions to the general public. Before dying in 1888, he saw both his community and his method of approach well embedded in American Catholic life.

Today the Society of St. Paul numbers 221 priests and some 150 students in preparation for the priesthood. In a recent tribute,

Archbishop Richard D. Cushing of Boston said of them: « The influence of the Paulists on the growth of the Catholic Church in America has been far out of proportion to their numerical strength. They have now reached the point at which their identification with the future of American Catholicism is assured. »

Protestant Educator Warns against Overemphasis on Church - State Issue

A Protestant educator recently averred in Washington that overemphasis on separation of Church and state « tends to defeat the deeper interests of Protestants in combatting the secularization of American culture. »

Dr. E. Clinton Gardner, professor of ethics at Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, also told a conference of the Methodist Board of Temperance that the founding fathers did not seek to separate the state from religion. « Indeed, » he said « they believed that the vitality of our democratic government and the welfare of the country depended to a large extent upon the strength and support which were made available through religious faith. »

Dr. Gardner pointed out that « a great deal of our discussion of the issue of Church and state is focused on the threat which Protestants see in Roman Catholicism. » « When attention is centered exclusively on the separation of Church and state, » he continued, « the impression is often left that the predominant relation of the Church and religion to the state and the political life is one of separation; and in the long run this negative approach tends to defeat the deeper interests of Protestants in combatting the secularization of American culture and in achieving justice at home and peace abroad. » (*NC*)

* * *

HOLLAND

Bishops' Pastoral Letter Discusses Changes in the Church's Disciplinary Laws

In a joint Lenten pastoral letter to the Catholics of the Netherlands, the Dutch Bishops have made it a point, on the one hand, to give reassurance to the traditionally-minded who have been taken aback by recent changes in the liturgy and the discipline of the Church; and on the other to appeal for understanding and patience on the part of those who feel that more changes should be made to keep pace with the rapid modifications in the present-

day world. Two of the issues singled out by the Bishops are the new dispositions regarding the Eucaristic fast and the concessions made in Germany for the ordination of a small number of married Protestant clergymen whose wives were still living. With such instances in mind, the letter explains:

« It is obvious that the Church must, so far as she can, take account of changing times and people, and that she will have to adapt herself to new circumstances in so far as she can and may. But it is not so clearly obvious to all the faithful where the boundaries of this ' can ' and ' may ' are to be drawn ... Thus, it may happen that the Church becomes a sign of contradiction to her own faithful; to one because she reforms too much, and to the other because she does not seem to be open enough to the demands of modern times ».

« It is obvious that all these reforms are only concerned with positive laws and institutions ordered by the Church herself for the spiritual welfare of the faithful, which she can, therefore, change or abrogate if she judges that, under changed circumstances, the salvation of the faithful will be served by it. But there are many other matters, in the realm of doctrine and Christian morals, that cannot be changed by the Church because they come from God Himself ». (*The Tablet*)

* * *

HUNGARY

Scandinavian Lutheran Leaders Protest State Interference In Church Affairs

An exchange of letters has recently taken place between the Lutheran Primates of four Scandinavian countries and Dr. Janos Horvath, chief of the Church Affairs Office of the Hungarian Government. The Lutheran bishops signing the letters to Dr. Horvath are: Archbishop Yngve Brilioth of Stockholm, Archbishop Ilmari Salomies of Helsinki, Bishop H. Fuglsang-Damgaard of Copenhagen, and Bishop Johannes Smemo of Oslo. They express the « deep disappointment which is felt throughout the Christian Church » over the undue interference on the part of the state in Hungarian Church affairs. « We cannot remain silent when Christian principles are infringed », they assert.

In particular, the Lutheran leaders deplore the treatment accorded to Bishop Ordass and Bishop Turoczy, both of whom were

deposed by the Government for failing to comply with unreasonable demands on the part of the State.

The Scandinavian Bishops further refute the charge by Dr. Horvath that in their countries bishops are appointed « according to the pleasure of kings » by pointing out that actually the role played by the State in such appointements is in keeping with the Lutheran practice there and differs from the situation in Hungary where force is exerted on the Church by the Government.

The Bishops conclude their second letter to Dr. Horvath by urging him to « do everything possible to remove abuses and create conditions that enable the true servants of the Church to do their work without hindrance ». (*EPS*)

* * *

GREECE

Catholic Exarch of Greece Consecrated at Athens

Father Hyacinth Gad was consecrated Titular Bishop of Gratianopolis and Apostolic Exarch of Catholics of the Byzantine Rite living in Greece in a ceremony at Athens in March. The consecration, conducted according to the ritual of the Byzantine Rite, was carried out by Melchite Rite Bishop George Hakim of Akka. Archbishop Marius Macrionitis, S. J. of Athens and Bishop Georges Xenopoulos, S. J. of Syra participated in the ceremony.

Bishop Gad succeeds as Exarch the late Bishop George Calavassy who died in November. Born in the Diocese of Syra, the new bishop studied at the Greek Pontifical College in Rome after he had finished his secondary education, and he was ordained there. After his return to Greece, he was active in Catholic Action work and became director of the Athens Catholic weekly, *Katholiki*. He is also the author of several books and pamphlets.

The new Exarch's appointment and consecration was carried out despite a request in December from the faculty of the University of Athens that the See be left vacant. Addressed to the Vatican after Bishop Calavassy's death, the request said that the existence of Greek Christians in communion with Rome has been a source of irritation between Greek Orthodox and Greek Catholics ever since the 16th century. By not appointing a new Apostolic Exarch, the message said, the Holy See would be removing a centuries-old source of discord and would be creating a climate favorable to good relations between the two bodies. (*NC*)

* * *

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

New Constitution Makes No Provision for Official Religion

No mention is made of a state religion in the provisional constitution of the new, predominantly Moslem United Arab Republic. The constitution of the new state asserts that « citizens are equal before the law, and no discrimination as to race, origin, religion, or belief will exist among them ». The omission in the document of a reference to an official religion is regarded by Catholic leaders as a great improvement over all previous Egyptian or Syrian constitutions.

The provisional constitution does not apply to Yemen, an almost wholly Moslem nation in southwestern Arabia, which has lately joined the U.A.R. The constitution was promulgated in Damascus, the former capital of Syria by the new republic's president, Abdel Gamal Nasser, who earlier had served as Egyptian chief of state. It describes the U.A.R. as a « democratic republic, independent and sovereign ».

There are about 342,000 Catholics in the United Arab Republic, which has a total population of approximately 27.5 million. (*La Croix*)

* * *

IRAQ

American Jesuit Conducts Lecture Series on Islamic Studies

Two former Iraqi prime ministers and the country's present Minister of Education were among the large audiences attending a series of lectures given at Bagdad in February by an American Jesuit father.

The lectures, sponsored by the faculty of Al-Hikma University, were delivered by Father Richard J. McCarthy, S. J., who spoke in Arabic on philosophy and wisdom, philosophy and religion, and the origins of Islamic philosophy.

The lecturer, a native of Springfield, Mass., and who received his doctorate in philosophy at Oxford, is director of Arabic studies at the Al-Hikma, which is conducted by American Jesuits. Father McCarthy began his Arabic studies in 1938 while teaching at Bagdad College and later proceeded to further studies in Rome and at Oxford, where he specialized in Moslem theology. (*NC*)

* * *

THE LEBANON

New Maronite Ordinary of Ancient City of Sidon Installed

An impressive ceremony of the Maronite Rite accompanied the installation of Bishop Antoine Koreiche as Bishop of Sidon of the Maronites. The ceremonies were held in the Cathedral of St. Elias in Saida, known in ancient times as Sidon. Bishop Joseph Khoury, patriarchal vicar of Antioch of the Maronites, presided.

Bishop Koreiche of Ain Ebel in the south of Lebanon, was ordained to the priesthood in 1930 and had been consecrated bishop in 1950, becoming apostolic administrator of Saida in the declining years of the late Bishop Augustine Boustany who died in 1957.

The Maronite Diocese of Saida has 60,478 Catholics out of a total population of 313,906, of whom two-thirds are Moslems. The city is also the see of a Melchite Byzantine Rite diocese, whose ordinary is Bishop Basil Khoury.

There are about five and half million Maronites in the world, with the greatest concentration of them in Lebanon and the Near Eastern countries. Their rite has the distinction of being the only Oriental rite of the Church which has no counterpart among the Orthodox or dissident churches. In the year 1182 the entire Maronite population submitted to the Holy See, abjuring any former allegiance to monophysite and monothelite heresies.

The liturgy of the Maronite Rite is based on the ancient Liturgy of St. James the Apostle, the source from which all Antiochene Rites — Syrian, Maronite, and Malankara — have developed. Syriac and Arabic are the two liturgical languages of the rite. Through Syriac, which is related to Aramaic, the Maronites claim close and abiding ties with the times of the Apostles and the early Church. (*SICO*)

* * *

BOOK REVIEWS

EDMOND CHAVAZ, *Cattolicismo ed Ecumenismo*. Edizioni Corsa dei Servi. Milan, 1957, pp. 68.

This attractively printed brochure contains the text of the conferences delivered by Abbé Chavaz at Milan during the Unity Octave. In its pages one will find a capable exposition and a serious discussion of the problem which ecumenism imposes on Catholic thought. The term « ecumenism » is understood in various senses at the present time, but it signifies above all an effort for the reunification of divided Christians. It is useful to distinguish, as the author happily does, between the Ecumenical Movement, which constitutes this very effort, and the institution which has resulted from it, namely, the World Council of Churches with headquarters at Geneva. Abbé Chavaz gives briefly an account of the origin and the principal manifestations of the Council, and with much sympathy and optimism describes its present tendencies. He likewise inquires as to how the Catholic Church could, without compromising its nature, acknowledge the requests of our separated brethren and dissipate a number of their prejudices.

What attitude is it proper for us to adopt in regard to non-Catholics? A polemical approach entails the risk of forgetting the good faith of the adversary; the apologetical approach tends to irritate our partners; while ecumenism runs the risk of compromising the purity of doctrine. But it is still possible to avoid these inconveniences. Abbé Chavaz recommends a prudent ecumenism, that is to say, a genuine apostolate which aims, not at making individual converts directly, but at leading to a more marked *rapprochement* between confessions. He looks to a convergent movement on the part of Catholics and non-Catholics with the goal being the unity of Christians. In any case, the convergence of Catholics would bring with it but accidental modifications which could be agreed upon even at the present time. The convergence of the others would have to be far more radical. However that may be, I believe that Abbé Chavaz would willingly agree that Catholics can concur in the efforts of the Ecumenical Movement in no better way than by demonstrating in all charitableness the soundness of the basic Catholic positions.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

T. F. Taylor, *A Profest Papist: Bishop John Gordon,* S. P. C. K. London 1958, 52 pages, price 7s 6d.

This book, short though it is, contains the fruits of much research. Unfortunately the labour put into it has produced little positive result, for though clearly the A. has searched in every place that might have preserved trace of John Gordon's activities, he found that few authentic records exist. By the aid of these he has established certain facts, the place and date of his birth, that he served in New York as a chaplain, was consecrated Bishop in Glasgow in 1688, was in Ireland and France with James II, made ouvertures for re-establishment in England, was mixed up in political intrigue, became a Catholic, in Rome petitioned the Pope to have his Orders declared null, and was given a small benefice.

In addition the A. found numerous gossipy references, mostly from Gordon's enemies, which predispose the reader to answer the questions, with which the A. ends many of the sections of his brochure, in a sense hostile to Gordon. For example: « Did he spend his time in New York (1674-84) preparing an attack on Protestantism which should establish Papistry? Did he go underground when he left New York to sharpen his weapon with Francis Turner or others of James's circle? » (p. 22). These questions are prompted by the fact that Gordon, living then in New York, *possibly* was author of a little anti-Protestant book published in 1679, which was entitled *Pax Vobis,* written by E. G. (the book does not indicate where it was printed; the reaction to it seems to have been in England). Yet the only *certain* information about Gordon in New York is an innocuous reference by a Dutch, and so, very Protestant, chaplain (1683), and the fact that Gordon's wife left a legacy to the poor of the Dutch Church there on 30 September 1684. That Gordon was author of *Pax Vobis* is unlikely. E. G. is not J. G. Fr. Quin (*Month,* February 1958 p. 107) suggests as author Edward Gee. Further, Gordon's previous connection with James, Duke of York, as far as documents inform us, was that, *if* ever he was a naval chaplain (quite uncertain, says the A. p. 13; though Dom Gregory Dix, quoted on p. 14, *modo suo* takes it as a fact) he would have been officially appointed by James as head of the Navy, as he was so appointed to the chaplaincy of New York. He also had a ' curious transaction ' with a Francis Turner who later benefited by James's friendship (p. 15). Why the author terms this transaction ' curious ' and so renders it prejudicial to Gordon is hard to see. It is ' curious ' in the use made of it, but that type of transaction must have been commonplace in those times. It consisted in this. As a certain Jones was going from

New York to England, Gordon entrusted to him in December 1683 several letters, one of which, that to Turner, he was to deliver personally. Jones was delayed *en route,* could not conveniently meet Turner in London and so gave the letter to another for delivery. On his return to New York, not finding Gordon there, for he had left, he wrote out and had witnessed the reason for his having fulfilled his commission not in person but by proxy. This certificate is dated 3 September 1686. The A. goes on: « It is strange that the letters did not reach Turner until 1686, and it is not impossible that they concerned York's proselytizing activities ». But it is as certain as it can be that the letter (not letters) did reach Turner shortly after Jones's arrival in England, May 1684 — his certificate implies this (p. 16). 1686 is the date of the certificate, written after Jones's return to New York, a certificate which says nothing about the content of the letter, and so gives no ground whatsoever to connect it with James, Duke of York. The A. goes on to speak of James's 'activities' and then, in view presumably of the fact that Gordon did become Bishop of Galloway in 1688, notes: « There seems little reason to doubt that Gordon freely and completely put himself into James's hands » (p. 17). When documents establishing facts are scarce, one has to hazard hypotheses, but care should be taken not to come to regard such hypotheses as facts and to build arguments on them. This is a danger that all historians experience, and one that the A. of this book has not altogether avoided. In any case an accumulation of hypotheses, all with the same tendency, conveys to an unwary reader a definite, possibly erroneous, conclusion.

Twice it is stated that Gordon was rebaptised in Rome, the first time in a quotation from a newspaper article written in 1853 by an anonymous Llewellyn which gives no references (p. 28); the second time (p. 40) reference is given to Le Quien II p. 315, though this may regard only the reception of the tonsure. Le Quien certainly says nothing there either about the Baptism or the Confirmation of Gordon: he states only that Gordon received minor orders in St. Mary Major's. Gordon was confirmed in Rome. The papal decree that imposed Ordination expressly enjoined also Confirmation. But nothing there was said of Baptism. It was, indeed, not likely that it would be, since Catholic theology does not and did not require an ordained minister for that sacrament, and so Gordon was most probably not rebaptised, even conditionally. Llewellyn's hypothesis that Gordon assumed the name 'Clement' at his Roman Baptism is discounted by the plain statement of James Gordon, writing from Rome on 20 May 1704 (quoted by the A. p. 44,, that Clement was Gordon's Confirmation name.

Mr. Taylor has a difficulty in that Le Quien, Estcourt, and Brandi give different versions of the preamble and the decree about Gordon, not indeed as regards the meaning, but in phraseology. They all give the same date, which should have made the A. hesitate to challenge it (especially as his, as he himself says, is self-contradictory); and the reproductions of two different documents in Brandi ('Delle ordinazioni anglicane', Roma, pp. 178, 199) clearly support that same date. The fact that Brandi includes reproductions of two documents, both giving the decree of the pope and a preamble yet with slight verbal differences, indicates, I think, the answer to the A's difficulty — Estcourt, Le Quien, and Brandi quote copies of different papers of which there would have been quite a collection before the case was complete and the file had been passed to the various people concerned « for their information and necessary action ». Whether the decree was made public or not immediately is unimportant. It was certainly known, for Gordon was publicly given minor orders; and James Gordon reported it, stressing the significant word *ordinetur* and the absence of *sub conditione* to his correspondent Innes in Paris on 1 July 1704 (p. 45). Whether, indeed, the decree was ambiguous, as the A. states p. 46), the reader may judge for himself from the text (which the A. nowhere quotes in full): « His Holiness, having heard the opinions of the most eminent cardinals, decreed that John Clement Gordon be ordained afresh and unconditionally to all Orders even sacred ones, and especially the Presbyterate, and, seeing that he has not been confirmed, that he first receive the sacrament of Confirmation » (translated from the reproduction in *Brandi,* Op. cit. p. 199. *Quatenus* according to *Lewis and Short,* 'A Latin Dictionary', means « seeing that », « since », « as »; the meaning « in case », « inasmuch as » are not given. Cf. A. p. 38).

The blurb on the back of the book declares: « An important result of his investigations is that he has been able to demonstrate conclusively that, by whatever rite Gordon was ordained, it was not that of 1662 ». The author is more restrained: « It was most unlikely to have been that of 1552, rather unlikely to have been that of 1662 » (pp. 11-12). The truth is that all that is known of Gordon's ordination is what he himself says in his petition to the Pope. The A. takes this as referring to his episcopal consecration (p. 4), but as Gordon mentions the delivery of the Bible and the words that accompany it as these are found in the 'Ordering of Priests', and as elsewhere he describes his episcopal consecration differently, he must be referring here to his ordination, and that by a form consistent with either the 1552 or the 1662 Prayer Book.

More is known about the rite of his consecration, because it

is briefly described in the Holy Office papers (Estcourt p. cxv; A. p. 49). It corresponds to the 1552 rite (the mention of hands on the shoulders is of no significance). Fr. Quin suggests that, owing to Wedderburn's complaints of the inadequacy of the 1620 Scottish rite, and Charles II's instructions about its amendment, a new rite was introduced in 1636 combining the 1552 English rite with the 1620 Scottish one, and that Gordon was consecrated by that (*Month* ibid. p. 106).

However that may be, it is quite certain that the Holy Office, when it was discussing Gordon's case, possessed a copy of the 1662 Prayer Book. It is also morally certain that that Prayer Book was taken into account by the assessors, for they certainly re-examined the various *vota* that had been given about the 1684 French Calvinist case, *vota* that had been based on the 1662 Prayer Book. Further the matter and form for the episcopate, as narrated by Gordon, which omits the additions made in the 1662 Prayer Book, are those of the 1552 Book, and it was this form that was, in fact, condemned by Leo XIII in *Apostolicae curae*. It is, then, hard to see why Anglicans challenge the Pope's statement that Gordon's case is a genuine precedent.

The A. of this painstaking brochure tries to be as impartial as he can and not draw firm conclusions that go beyond what his documents warrant. These, however, give so few thoroughly reliable facts that he is inevitably forced to hazard hypothetical conclusions, perhaps a little too much and too boldly. But the discerning reader is offered the possibility of judging for himself, for he has at his disposal all the available evidence, given him by the A., who for this too merits our sincere gratitude.

C. Hoare, *Anglican Ordinations in the Reign of Queen Mary,* 35 pages, obtainable from the author at St. Augustine's Nursing Home, 25 Upper Maze Hill, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex (England), price eighteen pence.

In this short pamphlet Fr. Hoare examines the papal documents issued to regulate the return of England to the Church during Mary's reign. There were the Bull of August 1553, repeated and augmented in that of March 1554 from Pope Julius III; *Praeclara charissimi* of June 1555 from Paul IV and the Brief *Regimini* of the same Pope in October 1555. These dealt with benefices past and present and with Orders past and present, so that unless they are read carefully they may seem very involved. But they are not — they hardly could be — as involved as the late Dom

Gregory Dix made them out to be. They are involved and self-contradictory only if their basic presupposition is not understood, either from ignorance of Catholic theology or from a contradictory presupposition in the mind of the reader.

The basic presupposition of the papal documents is that only those Ordinations are valid that are done *in forma ecclesiae,* where *forma ecclesiae* means the Church's rite; so that Ordinations not done *in forma ecclesiae* are invalid. Orders, therefore, performed by the Edwardine Ordinal were not done *in forma ecclesiae,* and so were not valid.

The contradictory presupposition than can bring confusion to the mind of the reader is the belief that the Edwardine Ordinal, in either of its versions, can convey Catholic Orders.

Paul IV, having himself created doubts by treating Heath as an Edwardine bishop when he was really an Henrician one, wrote the Brief *Regimini* to establish the principle and to dissipate doubt. The principle was: those promoted to Orders by bishops who were not ordained and consecrated *in forma ecclesiae* « have not received Orders »; those promoted by bishops, even though schismatical, but ordained and consecrated *in forma ecclesiae,* « have received the sacred character of Orders ». The Henrician Ordinal in both its varieties was not the *forma ecclesiae.* Such, in fact, was the teaching of all the papal documents sent to Pole; such was, in fact, also the criterion of Pole's action towards the English clergy and of the faculties he delegated to others.

Fr. Hoare treats of all this question very well and very clearly, quoting at length from the papal documents. His tractate is an answer to the relevant section of Dix's *The Question of Anglican Orders.* This section, if it were not part of the widely diffused and influential book, would hardly merit a reply, certainly not one so detailed. As it is, the need to keep on bringing in bits from Dix and pointing out misunderstandings, and mistakes has made it harder to achieve a smooth development of the argument.

On p. 32, should « Estcourt App. XVI » not read « Estcourt App. XIX »? Pp. 16, 20, has not *haeresim huiusmodi* a wider connotation in the context than heresy « concerning Orders »?)

J. Gill, S. J.

THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

is an international organization whose purpose it is to promote the spiritual union of men and especially of Christians. It was founded in Rome in 1945 *by a group of professors and writers, priests and laymen; and in June of that year received the blessing of Pope Pius XII. Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome, was elected president of the Association and also serves as editor of its organ* Unitas *which appears in three editions: English, French, and Italian.*

Established at the center of Catholicity, the Unitas Association in carrying on its activities endeavours to follow with studied perfection the guidance of the Holy See. In striving to fulfill its purpose, it attempts to regulate its mission in accordance with the following principles:

To Catholics it recalls the benefits of the unity which they enjoy and the duty which is incumbent upon them to pray for those who are deprived of it. The Association invites the active co-operation of Catholics and exhorts them to keep ever before them the advice of Pope Pius XI: « This unity ought to be promoted less by discussion or other means than by the example of a saintly life ».

To its separated brethren of the Eastern Churches, it speaks of those long glorious centuries of union when the Doctors of the East illumined the universal Church and triumphed with their Latin brethren over the most subtle and distressing heresies. Unitas lays stress upon all that the separated East has preserved in common with Catholics: the priesthood, the Sacraments, the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It makes clear the duty of union and strives to eliminate the barriers which prejudice and resentment have in the course of the centuries erected between Christians of the East and West.

To Anglicans and Protestants, Unitas reveals the genuine character of the Roman Catholic Church. Across the imperfections of men, it tries to make evident that spirit of fraternal affection and faithfulness to the teachings of Christ which is at the very heart of the Church's life and the manifestation of the Holy Spirit at work in her. Finally, Unitas keeps in close touch with the Ecumenical Movement, and endeavours to aid it in its quest for unity.

* * *

The Unitas Association has affiliated groups in Italy, France, Belgium, Canada, and Turkey. All that is necessary to form a group of this kind to further the aim of Christian unity is that a small number of persons of good will plan their organization, obtain the approval of their bishop, and then make their step known to the Central Committee of the Association in Rome.